DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 815. CG 004 965

AUTHOR	Dispenzieri, Angelo; And Others
TITLE	Characteristics of the College Discovery Program Students: 1964--1967. College Discovery Program. Research and Evaluation Unit.
PUB DATE	20 Jul 68
NOTE	165p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.35
DESCRIPTORS	College Students, Counseling, Culturally Disadvantaged, *Disadvantaged Youth, Ethnic Groups, *Higher Education, Junior Colleges, *Minority Groups, Negroes, *Program Evaluation, Puerto Ricans, Research Projects, *Special Programs, Special Services, Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This program was designed to provide higher education opportunities for disadvantaged students of intellectual promise whose high school scholastic averages, aptitude test scores and personal finances preclude admission under regular procedures to baccalaureate programs of the City University of New York. The goal of the program was to have students complete their first two years of college work at a community college and then transfer to a senior college to complete their baccalaureate requirements. Special help was offered: (1) tutoring (2) remedial courses; (3) counseling; and (4) financial assistance. The majority of students were Negroes followed by Puerto Ricans, white, Spanish-speaking students other than Puerto Ricans and Asians. More than half of the students were males. Approximately 130 tables are included. (Author/EK)

ED036815

CHARACTERISTICS OF
THE COLLEGE DISCOVERY PROGRAM STUDENTS:
1964 - 1967

COLLEGE DISCOVERY PROGRAM
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION UNIT

ANGELO DISPENZIERI
Director of Research

SEYMOUR GINIGER
Sr. Research Associate

SIDNEY WEINHEIMER
Research Associate

CANDIDO de LEON
University Coordinator
(7/1/66 to 6/30/68)

July 20, 1968

CG004965

ED036815

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Chancellor Bowker for providing us the support and professional independence needed to investigate a program that has not had a parallel in higher education. The attempt to introduce a large student population with particular educational deficiencies into an educational establishment with its complex rules and regulations without jarring and disrupting administration, faculties and students, is a monumental task. This is readily apparent to organizational theorists and investigators. The College Discovery Program has achieved this success. The program and its students have been incorporated into the educational main stream of the junior and senior colleges of the City University.

This report deals with the characteristics of our population; others will examine some of the causes of student successes and failures.

We are grateful to the staff of the Research and Evaluation Unit whose tireless efforts are represented in this report. We especially want to thank Mrs. Therese R. Belsito who aided us in the reorganization of the unit. Without her assistance the work of the professional psychologists could not go on. And we thank, too, Wendall Bentley, Jerry Chase and Frances Matsoukas whose dedication to the College Discovery Program went over and beyond the demands of the job requirements.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

LIST OF TABLES iii - xiv

SUMMARY xv - xix

SECTION

I INTRODUCTION 1

A. The Program 1

B. Selection of Students: 1964-1967 2

C. Community College Placement 5

II ETHNIC AND SEX DISTRIBUTION AMONG ENTERING STUDENTS 6

A. Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution of Total College Discovery Program Population 6

B. Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution in Each Entering Class: 1964-1967 8

C. Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution in Each Community College 18

D. Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution in Each Entering Class at Each Community College 29

E. Comparison of Ethnic Distribution of College Discovery Program Students and CUNY Students 56

III PERFORMANCE IN HIGH SCHOOL, COMMUNITY COLLEGE, AND SENIOR COLLEGE 63

A. High School Diplomas: 1964-1967 63

B. High School Diplomas and Grade Point Averages for Each Community College 72

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

SECTION		PAGE
IV	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AND GRADUATION FROM THE COLLEGE DISCOVERY PROGRAM	88
V	COLLEGE DISCOVERY PROGRAM GRADUATES	101
	A. Enrollment in Senior Colleges	101
	B. College Discovery Program Graduates Who Did not Enter a Senior College	101
	C. Senior College Enrollment: College, Session and Current Registration	106
	D. Ethnicity and Sex of Senior College Students	110
	E. Choice of Senior College of CUNY	113
	F. Withdrawals from Senior College	117
VI	SENIOR COLLEGE PERFORMANCE OF COLLEGE DISCOVERY PROGRAM GRADUATES	120
	A. Senior College Credits Earned and Grade Point Averages	120
	B. Performance in CUNY and NON-CUNY Senior Colleges	125
	C. Credits Earned and Grade Point Averages in Each Senior College	131
	D. Senior College Performance as Related to Community College Attended	138
	E. Relationship of Ethnic Group and Sex to Performance in Senior College	138
APPENDIX		Appendix 1

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution of All Students	7
2	Comparison of Negroes with All Other Ethnic Groups by Sex (Including Chi Square Analysis)	9
3	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution in 1964	10
4	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution in 1965	11
5	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution in 1966	12
6	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution in 1967	13
7	Comparison of Ethnic Groups in 1964 Entering Class with 1965-1967 Entering Classes Combined (Including Chi Square Analysis)	15
8	Distribution of Major Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	16
9A	Distribution of Native-Born Negro vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Aquare Analysis)	17
9B	Distribution of Native-Born White vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	17
9C	Distribution of Puerto Rican vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	17
10	Sex Distribution for the Three Major Ethnic Groups Combined for the 1965-1967 Entering Classes	19
11A	Sex Distribution of Puerto Ricans by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	20
11B	Sex Distribution of Native-Born Whites by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	20
11C	Sex Distribution of Native-Born Negroes by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	20

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
12	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution at Bronx Community College	21
13	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution at Queensborough Community College	22
14	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution at Kingsborough Community College	23
15	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution at Manhattan Community College	24
16	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution at New York City Community College	25
17	Ethnic Group Distribution by Community College	27
18A	Sex Distribution by Community College (Including Chi Square Analysis)	28
18B	Chi Square Values for Comparisons Between Community Colleges for Sex Distribution	28
19	Sex Distribution of Native-Born Negroes by Community College (Including Chi Square Analysis)	30
20A	Sex Distribution of Native-Born Whites by Community College (Including Chi Square Analysis)	31
20B	Chi Square Values for Comparisons between Community Colleges for Sex Distribution of Native-Born Whites	31
21A	Sex Distribution of Puerto Ricans by Community College (Including Chi Square Analysis)	32
21B	Chi Square Values for Comparisons between Community Colleges for Sex Distribution of Puerto Ricans	32
22	Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution for 1964 Entering Class at Bronx Community College	33

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE — PAGE

23 Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution for 1964 Entering Class at Queensborough Community College 34

24 Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution for 1965 Entering Class at Bronx Community College 35

25 Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution for 1965 Entering Class at Queensborough Community College 36

26 Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution for 1965 Entering Class at Kingsborough Community College 37

27 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1965 Entering Class at Manhattan Community College 38

28 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1965 Entering Class at New York City Community College 39

29 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1966 Entering Class at Bronx Community College 40

30 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1966 Entering Class at Queensborough Community College 41

31 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1966 Entering Class at Kingsborough Community College 42

32 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1966 Entering Class at Manhattan Community College 43

33 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1966 Entering Class at New York City Community College 44

34 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1967 Entering Class at Bronx Community College 45

35 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1967 Entering Class at Queensborough Community College 46

36 Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1967 Entering Class at Kingsborough Community College 47

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
37	Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1967 Entering Class at Manhattan Community College	48
38	Sex and Ethnic Group Disttibution for 1967 Entering Class at New York City Community College	49
39A	Bronx Negroes (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	50
39B	Bronx Puerto Ricans vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	50
39C	Bronx Whites (USA-Born vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	50
40A	Queensbrough Negroes (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	51
40B	Queensborough Puerto Ricans vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	51
40C	Queensborough Whites (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (including Chi Square Analysis)	51
41A	Kingsborough Negroes (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	52
41B	Kingsborough Puerto Ricans vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	52
41C	Kingsborough Whites (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	52
42A	Manhattan Negroes (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	53

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
42B	Manhattan Puerto Ricans vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	53
42C	Manhattan Whites (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	53
43A	New York City Negroes (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	54
43B	New York City Puerto Ricans vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	54
43C	New York City Whites (USA-Born) vs All Other Ethnic Groups by Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	54
44	Ethnic Group Distribution of CUNY Students by Matriculation Status at Senior and Community Colleges in 1967	57
45	Ethnic Group Distribution of CUNY Students for Colleges in Manhattan for 1967	58
46	Ethnic Group Distribution of CUNY Students for Colleges in Queens for 1967	60
47	Ethnic Group Distribution of CUNY Students for Colleges in Brooklyn for 1967	61
48	Ethnic Group Distribution of CUNY Students for Colleges in The Bronx for 1967	62
49	High School Diploma by Entering Class	64
50	High School Diploma by Community College	65
51A	High School Diploma by Entering Class at Bronx	67
51B	Distribution of High School Diplomas at Bronx vs All Other Community Colleges (Including Chi Square Analysis)	67

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
52A	High School Diploma by Entering Class at Queensborough	68
52B	Distribution of High School Diplomas at Queensborough vs all other Community Colleges (Including Chi Square Analysis)	68
53A	High School Diploma by Entering Class at Kingsborough	69
53B	Distribution of High School Diplomas at Kingsborough vs all other Community Colleges (Including Chi Square Analysis)	69
54A	High School Diploma by Entering Class at Manhattan	70
54B	Distribution of High School Diplomas at Manhattan vs all other Community Colleges (Including Chi Square Analysis)	70
55A	High School Diploma by Entering Class at New York City	71
55B	Distribution of High School Diplomas at New York City vs all other Community Colleges (Including Chi Square Analysis)	71
56	High School Diploma by Community College for 1964 Entering Class	73
57	High School Diploma and Average by Community College for 1965 Entering Class	74
58	High School Diploma and Average for 1966 Entering Class	75
59	High School Diploma and Average by Community College for 1967 Entering Class	76
60	Academic vs All Other Diplomas by Community College for 1964 Entering Class	77

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
61	Academic vs All Other Diplomas for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes	78
62	Academic vs All Other Diplomas by Community College for 1965 Entering Class	79
63	Mean High School Averages and Analysis of Variance for Academic Diplomas by Community College for 1965 Entering Class	81
64	Academic vs All Other Diplomas by Community College for 1966 Entering Class. (Including Chi Square Analysis)	82
65	Chi Square Values for Comparisons Between Community Colleges for Academic vs All Other Diplomas for 1966 Entering Class	83
66	Mean High School Averages and Analysis of Variance for Academic Diplomas by Community College for 1966 Entering Class	84
67	Academic vs All Other Diplomas by Community College for 1967 Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	85
68	Mean High School Averages and Analysis of Variance for Academic Diplomas by Community College for 1967 Entering Class	86
69	Graduation from Community College as of January, 1968, by High School Diploma for 1964 Entering Class	89
70	Community College Graduates vs Non-Graduates for 1964 Entering Class with Academic Diplomas (Including Chi Square Analysis)	90
71	Community College Graduates vs Non-Graduates for 1964 Entering Class with Non-Academic Diplomas (Including Chi Square Analysis)	92
72	Total Graduates vs Non-Graduates by Community College for 1964 Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	93

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
73	Graduation from Community College as of January, 1968 by High School Diploma for 1965 Entering Class	94
74	Community College Graduates vs Non-Graduates for 1965 Entering Class with Academic Diplomas (Including Chi Square Analysis)	95
75	Community College Graduates vs Non-Graduates for 1965 Entering Class with Non-Academic Diplomas (Including Chi Square Analysis)	96
76	Total Graduates vs Non-Graduates by Community College for 1965 Entering Class (Including Chi Square Anslysis)	97
77	Chi Square Values for Comparisons between Community Colleges for Total Graduates vs Non-Graduates for 1965 Entering Class (Including Chi Square Analysis)	98
78	Graduation from Community College as of January, 1968 by High School Diploma for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	100
79	Community College Graduation and Senior College Entrance as of Spring, 1968 by Community College for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined (Including Chi Square Analysis)	102
80	Community College Graduation and Senior College Entrance as of Spring, 1968 by Community College for 1964 Entering Class	103
81	Community College Graduation and Senior College Entrance as of Spring, 1968 by Community College for 1965 Entering Class	104
82	Present Status of Grates Not Entering Senior College by Community College for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	105
83	Present Status of Graduates Not Entering Senior College by Ethnic Group for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	107

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
84	Status of Graduates Entering Senior College, Type of College, and Session as of Spring, 1968 for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	108
85	Status of Graduates Entering Senior College, Type of College, and Session as of Spring, 1968 for 1964 Entering Class	109
86	Status of Graduates Entering Senior College, Type of College, and Session as of Spring, 1968 for 1965 Entering Class	111
87	Graduation from CDP and Entrance and Withdrawal from Senior College as of Spring, 1968 by Sex and Ethnic Group for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	112
88	Graduates of 1964 Entering Class who Entered a CUNY Senior College by Session and College as of Spring, 1968 Registration	114
89	Graduates of 1965 Entering Class who Entered a CUNY Senior College by Session and College as of Spring, 1968 Registration	116
90	Graduates of 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined who Entered a CUNY Senior College by Session and College as of Spring, 1968 Registration	118
91	Graduates of 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined who Withdrew from Senior College by Community College	119
92	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Community College for 1964 Entering Class	121
93	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Community College for 1965 Entering Class	123
94	T-Test Values for Differences in Mean Senior College Credits Between Community Colleges for 1965 Entering Class	124

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
95	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Community College for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	126
96	T-Test Values for Differences in Mean Senior College Grade Point Average Between Community Colleges for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	127
97	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Session and College for 1964 Entering Class	128
98	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Session and College for 1965 Entering Class	130
99	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Session and College for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	132
100	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by CUNY and Non-CUNY Senior College and Session for 1964 Entering Class	133
101	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by CUNY and Non-CUNY Senior College and Session for 1965 Entering Class	134
102	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by CUNY and Non-CUNY Senior College and Session for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	136
103	T-Test Values for Differences in Mean Credits Between CUNY Colleges for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	137
104	T-Test Values for Differences in Mean Grade Point Average Between CUNY Colleges for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	139
105	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Community and Senior College for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	140

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

TABLE		PAGE
106	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Sex and Ethnic Group for 1964 and 1965 Entering Classes Combined	141
107	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Sex and Ethnic Group for 1964 Entering Class	142
108	Senior College Credits and Grade Point Average as of January, 1968 by Sex and Ethnic Group for 1965 Entering Class	143

SUMMARY

In 1964, the initial year of the College Discovery Program, students were enrolled in two schools, Bronx and Queensborough. In each of the later years, 1965 to 1967, students also enrolled in Kingsborough, Manhattan and New York City Community Colleges.

Over two-fifths of the students who entered CDP were Negroes born in the United States, one-fourth were Puerto Rican, and one-fifth were white, while foreign-born Negroes and whites, Spanish-speaking students other than Puerto Ricans, and Asians contributed smaller numbers to the population. The proportions of major ethnic groups in the entering classes remained relatively stable in recent years. Only the original 1964 entering class deviated from this pattern; more Negroes and fewer Puerto Ricans were accepted in this class than in later classes.

Slightly more than half the entering students were males, although among both USA and foreign-born Negroes slightly more than half were female.

The number of females in each entering class has decreased significantly in recent years, while the number of males has remained constant. Much of the decrease in proportion of females is due to a dwindling number of white females.

The proportion of negroes at Queensborough and Kingsborough is higher than at other schools, while the proportion of Puerto Ricans at the same two schools is lower than at other schools. Bronx and Manhattan have fewer white students than other schools.

Although four community colleges had more men than women, New York City enrolled more women than men. The distribution of males and females among Negroes was similar at each school, more females than males. Among USA-born whites, the ratio of males to females ranged from 3:1 at Manhattan to 1:1 at New York City. For the Puerto Rican group, Queensborough enrolled three times more males than females, while New York City had an equal proportion of males and females.

Comparisons of the ethnic distribution of CDP students to that of regularly enrolled CUNY students indicated that CDP is accomplishing its mission of providing minority group members with college experience. An ethnic survey conducted among registrants in the City University system in the Fall of 1967 showed that the majority of students in both senior and community colleges was white while, as indicated above, only one-fifth of the CDP population was white. Comparing ethnic distributions of all colleges in each borough, it was found that those boroughs which have the smallest Negro representation in senior colleges had the largest Negro representation in CDP. Puerto Rican enrollment in senior or community college never exceeded 10% in any institution, while in CDP Puerto Rican enrollment ranged from 35% at Manhattan and Bronx to 18% at Queensborough.

Almost 75% of the CDP admissions had academic high school dipolmas, the remainder having general, vocational, commercial and technical diplomas, in that order. The percentages of the various kinds of high school diplomas have remained relatively constant from 1964 to 1967. The mean high school average for each entering class was approximately 75.

Twenty-three percent of the 1964 CDP class and 28% of the 1965 class completed community college by January, 1968. Graduation rates differed among community colleges. In the first year, many Queensborough students who might otherwise have continued were prematurely terminated because of shortages of space. In the second year, New York City had a significantly larger percentage of graduates than all other schools (in part because of its liberal grading practices), while Queensborough had a significantly smaller percentage of graduates than all other schools but Bronx. Over one-eighth of those in the 1965 class who did not graduate after two years were still enrolled in community college in Spring, 1968.

Over two-fifths of the technical diploma students eventuallly graduated community college, followed by commercial, academic, vocational and general diploma students, in that order. The relatively mediocre showing of academic diploma students, especially considering their pre-college preparation, deserves further study as does the impressive success of technical diploma recipients.

Eighty-eight percent of the community college graduates entered senior college by January, 1968. Graduates who did not enter senior college are not necessarily dropouts from further training; several graduates entered the military or took additional schooling.

Most of those who went on to senior college entered day sessions in the City University; others entered day sessions outside of CUNY and evening sessions within CUNY and outside of CUNY, in that order. Ninety-four percent of those who entered senior college were still enrolled by

Spring, 1968. All of those who dropped out had been enrolled in day sessions, all but one in CUNY. New York City had four dropouts, Kingsborough had three, all other community colleges had one.

Almost equal percentages of males and females graduated CDP and continued on to senior college. The percentage of senior college withdrawals is again almost exactly equal for both sexes. Puerto Ricans graduated a greater percentage of students than USA-born whites or Negroes. Members of other ethnic groups graduated CDP and went on to senior college in slightly greater percentages than any of the three major ethnic groups. Among the other ethnic groups, foreign-born Negroes graduated from CDP least often.

Most of the 1964 class who entered senior college enrolled in CCNY. In the 1965 class, the most popular senior college choices were CCNY, Richmond, and Hunter, and Hunter was also the most popular choice of evening college students of both graduating classes. Most CDP graduates went to senior college in the Borough of Manhattan.

The mean senior college grade point average for 1964 CDP graduates was 2.46 (between C and B); they earned an average 25.7 credits by January, 1968. The 1965 class had a mean senior college grade point average of 1.91, and earned a mean of nearly 12 credits by January 1968. The mean grade point average for both years combined was 2.11. The graduates of Bronx and Queensborough had the highest grade point averages, while New York City graduates had the lowest grade point averages and earned the fewest senior college credits.

Combining the 1964 and 1965 classes, City University students earned almost the same mean number of credits as non-City University students. Students enrolled at Queens earned the greatest number of credits, while Richmond students earned significantly fewer credits than students at all other schools with the exception of Baruch. Richmond students also had the lowest grade point averages, while Queens and Hunter students earned the highest grade point averages.

CCNY and Hunter, the most popular choices of graduates from both Bronx and Queensborough, were schools in which CDP graduates did very well, while the most popular choice of New York City graduates (Richmond) was the school in which students performed most poorly.

Although females tended to earn more credits and achieve higher grade point averages than males in both graduating classes, the overall differences were not statistically significant. However, Negro females earned significantly higher grade point averages than Negro males.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COLLEGE DISCOVERY PROGRAM STUDENTS:

1964 - 1967

I. Introduction

A. The Program

The College Discovery Program is designed to provide higher education for socially disadvantaged students of intellectual promise whose high school scholastic averages, aptitude test scores and personal finances preclude admission under regular procedures to baccalaureate programs of the City University of New York. The goal of the program is to have students complete their first two years of college work at a community college and then to transfer to a senior college to complete their baccalaureate requirements. An integral part of the program is the provision of special help to overcome some of the educational deficiencies which might handicap these students in their college work. This assistance includes intensive remedial courses at the community colleges in the summer preceding entrance into regular classes, special counseling and financial assistance, and, if necessary, tutoring during the freshman year.

The program is experimental in nature. The inclusion of a wide range of students who would not ordinarily be eligible for college is highly important, particularly in the early years of the pgoram, in order to permit investigation of the relationship of various characteristics to success in the program. Students have not been selected exclusively according to the usual criteria of grades and test scores.

By eliminating students judged to be "poor risks" on the basis of established criteria developed for typical college-bound populations, the chance of testing the validity of these criteria as predictors of success for our atypical population would be lost.

B. Selection of Students: 1964-1967

Selection of students was a two-step process: nominations for the program were solicited from high school principals and guidance counselors and selections of those to be admitted were made from the nominees. The criteria used for acceptance included academic preparation, and social and economic status of the family.

To insure the selection of students from economically deprived areas, each high school is alloted a specific number of nominations based on an Index of Deprivation developed by the Board of Education's High School Division. Every high school is alloted a minimum of two nominees. Additional nominations are allowed if the high school had a special study center, if there is a high degree of reading retardation in the school, or if there is evidence of a low median IQ level in the school. Nominations are accepted from parochial and private schools, as well as public schools.

Nominations and evaluations from principals are accompanied by letters of recommendation from two teachers, high school transcripts, and records of tests and other activities relevant to future education. Nominees provide information primarily about family, social and economic background.

The academic criterion for acceptance into CDP has changed somewhat from year to year. The basic criterion is a straightforward count of the number of high school credits earned which are normally required for college admission. In view of the nature of the program, the academic criterion was not stringent. If an applicant came close to completing the required college admission credits he was accepted. Those who fell far short of these requirements were rejected because it was not feasible to make up the lack during summer remedial sessions.

The criterion for acceptance in the 1964 class was completion of at least fourteen of the sixteen high school credits required for college admission. Credits were counted regardless of grades or subjects in which deficiencies occurred. Twelve credits or fewer resulted in rejection. If an applicant had thirteen credits, grades and subject area deficiencies were taken into account; however, no applicant was eliminated on the basis of deficiencies in one subject alone. It was considered more serious if deficiencies occurred in science or mathematics than if they were in languages or social science.

In 1965, deficiencies in some subjects were considered more of a handicap than in others. The minimum academic criterion was simply the completion of at least one year of college preparatory mathematics. Thus, it was possible for an applicant to be accepted with fewer than twelve credits.

The number of academic credits was again considered in 1966. Because so many vocational high school students completed only twelve or twelve and a half credits, a new minimum of twelve credits was established. Exceptions were made among those students most highly recommended by their principals (first or second choices in schools nominating five or more condidates; third, fourth or fifth choices in schools nominating forty or more). The same academic criterion was used in 1967. Recommendations of principals for students with fewer than twelve credits were again employed, this year using a slightly more refined scale.

The economic criterion included family income and number of persons in the family. Exceptions were allowed where special conditions were operating (e.g., illness, sporadic employment, etc.). In the first two years of the program an income of $1700 per family member per year was used as a maximum cut-off point. Unless special conditions were present, no students were accepted beyond this level. In 1966 and 1967 the economic criterion was revised by taking into account appropriate cost of living figures of the Budget Standard Service. Additional refinements were made in 1967 to account for ages of children in the family and additional evidence of deprivation. Five deprivation criteria were used: (1) attendance at a vocational high school or a high school allotted 36 or more nominees; (2) attendance at a special service junior high school; (3) broken home; (4) parents who did not attend high school; and (5) cultural deprivation due to birthplace, language, or ethnic group.

After academic, economic and social criteria had been met, further screening was required because more students were eligible than facilities could accommodate. Prior to 1966, final screening involved assumptions about probable conditions for college success (e.g., high school grades and teachers' recommendations). However, these assumptions conflicted with the experimental and research aspects of the program, by biasing the selection procedure. Therefore, beginning in 1966, final selection was made on a random basis. In 1967, all those randomly rejected were referred to the SEEK program, where, we understand, most were accepted.

C. Community College Placement

Student preferences received first consideration in community college placement. However, it was necessary to shift some students to second choices or to colleges for which they had not expressed preferences but which appeared convenient to their residence. In making these shifts the primary consideration was whether the college to which they were assigned would provide the curriculum the student preferred. Sometimes the selection staff had to go beyond expressed curriculum preference to ultimate vocational aim to determine which community college was appropriate.

The first four entering classes of the College Discovery Program are the subjects of the following analyses. The analyses are divided into a description of ethnic and sex characteristics of entering students, high school diplomas and averages, present status of community college graduates, and senior college grade point averages.

II. Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution Among Entering Students

The Ethnic and sex distribution of College Discovery Program students will be described for each entering class and in each school. In addition, the ethnic distribution of the CDP population will be compared to that of the regularly enrolled population of the City University of New York.

A. Sex and Ethnic Group Distribution of Total College Discovery Program Population

The number and percentage of students in each ethnic group represented at the Community Colleges for the first four years of the College Discovery Program are presented in Table 1, as well as the number and percentage of men and women in each ethnic group.

Almost half the 1,689 students were Negroes born in the United States (43%). Foreign-born Negroes accounted for only five percent of the total population.[1]

One-fourth of the total population was Puerto Rican (either the student or his parents were born in Puerto Rico). Another five percent came from Spanish-speaking families other than Puerto Rican (either the student or his parents were born in a Latin American

---

[1] The countries of origin, in order of requency, are: Jamaica, British West Indies (unspecified), Haiti, Virgin Islands, Trinidad, Barbados, Antigua, Dutch West Indies, British Guiana, British Honduras, Panama, Ghana, England, Germany.

TABLE 1

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION OF ALL STUDENTS

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	323	44.8	398	55.2	721	42.7
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	269	63.9	152	36.1	421	24.9
White (USA born)	182	61.9	112	38.1	294	17.4
Other Spanish-speaking	51	59.3	35	40.7	86	5.1
Foreign-born Negro	38	47.5	42	52.5	80	4.7
Foreign-born White	35	63.6	20	36.4	55	3.3
Asian	17	58.6	12	41.4	29	1.7
Not ascertained	3	100.0	--	0.0	3	0.2
TOTALS	918	54.4	771	45.6	1,689	100.0

country or Spain, and speak Spanish).[2] For students classified as Puerto Rican or Spanish-speaking, no subdivision on the basis of skin color or country of birth was made.

One-fifth of the entrants were white, most of these native-born (17%), with a small number born in Europe, Africa or Asia (3%).[3] the rest of the students were Asian (2%), all but one of these Chinese.

Although there were more men (54%) than women (46%) in the total population, admissions among Negro women were more numerous than among Negro men, including both native born (55% female) and foreign born (52% female). All other ethnic groups included a higher proportion of men (about 60%) than women (about 40%). Table 2 shows that the different ratios of males to females among Negroes vs. all other ethnic groups was clearly significant ($X^2 = 52.07$, df = 1, $p < .001$).

Applicants who were accepted but did not enter the program are not included in the findings. In 1967, 18% of those accepted into CDP did not enter.

B. Ethnic and Sex Distribution in Each Entering Class: 1964-1967.

Tables 3 to 6 present the ethnic and sex distributions for each entering class.

---

[2] The countries of origin in order of frequency, are: Cuba, Panama, Dominican Republic, Columbia, Honduras, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Antigua, Peru, Venezuela, Argentina, Grand Cayman, Guatemala, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles, Nicaragua, Trinidad, Spain.

[3] The countries, in order of frequency, are: Italy, Germany, Rumania, Greece, Ireland, England, Poland, Yugoslavia, U.S.S.R., Egypt, Israel, Philippines, Malta, Jordan, Cyprus.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF NEGROES WITH ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY SEX

	MALE		FEMALE		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Negro (USA born & Foreign born)	361	45.1	440	54.9	801
All Others	554	62.6	331	37.4	885
TOTAL	915	54.3	771	45.7	1,686*

$X^2 = 52.07$

df = 1

p< = .001

*Excludes 3 males whose ethnicity was Not Ascertained.

TABLE 3

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION IN 1964

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	60	51.3	57	48.7	117	50.7
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	33	75.0	11	25.0	44	19.0
White (USA born)	30	73.2	11	26.8	41	17.7
Other Spanish-speaking	5	83.4	1	16.6	6	2.6
Foreign-born Negro	7	58.4	5	41.6	12	5.2
Foreign-born White	5	62.5	3	37.5	8	3.5
Asian	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	0.9
Not ascertained	1	100.0	--	0.0	1	0.4
TOTALS	142	61.2	89	38.8	231	100.0

TABLE 4

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION IN 1965

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	85	38.8	134	61.2	219	41.5
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	82	65.1	44	34.9	126	23.8
White (USA born)	52	49.1	54	50.9	106	20.0
Other Spanish-speaking	15	60.0	10	40.0	25	4.7
Foreign-born Negro	9	37.5	15	62.5	24	4.5
Foreign-born White	15	83.3	3	16.7	18	3.4
Asian	5	55.6	4	44.4	9	1.7
Not ascertained	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	0.4
TOTALS	265	50.1	264	49.9	529	100.0

TABLE 5

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION IN 1966

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	93	43.9	119	56.1	212	43.1
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	76	61.3	48	38.7	124	25.2
White (USA born)	52	66.7	26	33.3	78	15.8
Other Spanish-speaking	15	55.6	12	44.4	27	5.5
Foreign-born Negro	15	57.7	11	42.3	26	5.3
Foreign-born White	8	50.0	8	50.0	16	3.3
Asian	5	55.6	4	44.4	9	1.8
Not ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	264	53.7	228	46.3	492	100.0

TABLE 6

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION IN 1967

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	85	49.1	88	50.9	173	39.5
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	78	61.4	49	38.6	127	29.1
White (USA born)	48	69.6	21	30.4	69	15.8
Other Spanish-speaking	16	55.6	12	44.4	28	6.4
Foreign-born Negro	7	38.9	11	61.1	18	4.1
Foreign-born White	7	53.8	6	46.2	13	3.0
Asian	6	66.7	3	33.3	9	2.1
Not ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	247	56.5	190	43.5	437	100.0

The 1964 class consisted only of Bronx and Queensborough Community College students. Table 7 presents the ethnic breakdown for this class compared with the combined classes for the succeeding three years. The ethnic distribution of the 1964 class is different from that of the other three years ($X^2 = 8.75$, df = 3, $p < .05$). There were more Negroes and fewer Puerto Ricans in the first year's enrollment than in later years. Since only two of the five CDP schools were represented in the 1964 class, and since the ethnic distribution differed from that of later years, comparisons of this group with succeeding years would be misleading. Therefore, the 1964 group will not be included in ethnic comparisons made below.

During the period from 1965 to 1967, proportions of major ethnic groups entering CDP generally remained stable (Table 8). Negroes (USA born) made up approximately two-fifths of the total population, Puerto Ricans about one-fourth, and whites (USA born) approximately one-fifth.

Separate statistical analyses for each ethnic group indicated that the proportion of Negroes showed no significant change over time (Table 9A; $X^2 = 1.17$, df - 2, NS). The white proportion also remained relatively unchanged over time (Table 9B; $X^2 = 4.17$, df = 2, $p < .20$). However, there was a trend toward an increasing proportion of Puerto Ricans entering the program, although this trend did not quite reach statistical significance (Table 9C; $X^2 = 5.22$, df = 2, $p < .10$). It should be noted that the number of Puerto Rican students in each entering class remained stable over the three year period, while the total number of entrants into CDP dropped each year.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF ETHNIC GROUPS IN 1964 ENTERING CLASS WITH 1965-1967 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

ETHNIC GROUP	1964		1965-1967		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	117	50.7	604	41.4	721	42.7
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	44	19.0	377	25.9	421	24.9
White (USA born)	41	17.7	253	17.4	294	17.4
All Others	29	12.6	224	15.4	253	15.0
T O T A L S	231	13.7	1458	86.3	1689	100.0

$X^2 = 8.75$

$df = 3$

$p< = .05$

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF MAJOR ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Negro (USA born)		Puerto Rican		White (USA born)		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1965	219	41.4	126	23.8	106	20.0	78	14.7	529
1966	212	43.1	124	25.2	78	15.9	78	15.9	492
1967	173	39.6	127	29.1	69	15.8	68	15.6	437
T O T A L	604	41.3	377	25.9	253	17.4	224	15.4	1,458

$X^2 = 6.75$

df = 4

p< = .20

TABLE 9A

DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE-BORN NEGRO vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Negroes (USA born)		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	219	41.4	310	58.6	529
1966	212	43.1	280	56.9	492
1967	173	39.6	264	60.4	437
TOTAL	604	41.1	854	58.6	1,458

$X^2 = 1.17$
df = 2
Not Significant

TABLE 9B

DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE-BORN WHITE vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Whites (USA born)		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	106	20.0	423	80.0	529
1966	78	15.9	414	84.1	492
1967	69	15.8	368	84.2	437
TOTAL					

X2 = 4.17
df = 2
p< = .20

TABLE 9C

DISTRIBUTION OF PUERTO RICAN vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Puerto Rican		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	126	23.8	403	76.2	529
1966	124	25.2	368	74.8	492
1967	127	29.1	310	70.9	437
TOTAL	377	25.9	1,081	74.1	1,458

$X^2 = 5.22$
df = 2
p< = .10

Although the absolute number of entering males was relatively constant over time, there was a statistically significant decrease in the proportion of female entrants, from 51% in 1965 to 43% in 1967 (Table 10; $X^2 = 6.15$, df - 2, $p<.05$).

Table 11B reveals that the decrease in female enrollment is predominantly a function of changes within the native-born white group, with additional slight decreases in female enrollment among native-born Negroes (Table 11C). Matriculation among male and female Puerto Ricans remained stable over the three year period (Table 11A).

The criteria for acceptance into CDP (see above) provide special allowances for students' socio-economic deprivation.

Because of budgetary considerations, the number of enrollees in CDP has decreased from 1965 to 1967. Our figures indicate that the decrease in admission rates has affected females, especially whites, more than any other group. Since acceptance procedures make no special provisions for sex of applicant, it is impossible to determine at this time why the female rate of acceptance, especially the white female rate, has gone down.

C. Ethnic and Sex Distribution in Each Community College

The information presented earlier for the total CDP population is reported for each of the five colleges participating in the program in Tables 12 to 16. Preferences for and assignments to particular colleges are based in large part upon borough of residence. There were differences in the ethnic distributions at the colleges,

TABLE 10

SEX DISTRIBUTION FOR THE THREE MAJOR ETHNIC GROUPS COMBINED FOR THE 1965-1967 ENTERING CLASSES

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	
1965	219	48.6	232	51.4	451
1966	221	53.4	193	46.6	414
1967	211	57.2	158	42.8	369
TOTAL	651	52.8	583	47.2	1,234

$X^2 = 6.15$

df = 2

$p < = .05$

TABLE 11A

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF PUERTO RICANS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	82	65.1	44	34.9	126
1966	76	61.3	48	38.7	124
1967	78	61.4	49	38.6	127
TOTAL	236	62.6	141	37.4	377

$X^2 = 0.50$
df = 2
Not Significant

TABLE 11B

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE-BORN WHITES BY ENTERING CLASS

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	52	49.1	54	50.9	106
1966	52	66.7	26	33.3	78
1967	48	69.6	21	30.4	69
TOTAL	152	60.1	101	39.9	253

$X^2 = 9.38$
df = 2
$p < = .01$

TABLE 11C

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE-BORN NEGROES BY ENTERING CLASS

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	85	38.8	134	61.2	219
1966	93	43.9	119	56.1	212
1967	85	49.1	88	50.9	173
TOTAL	263	43.5	341	56.5	604

$X^2 = 4.19$
df = 2
$p < = .20$

TABLE 12

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION AT BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	97	46.6	111	53.4	208	40.8
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	126	68.1	59	31.9	185	36.3
White (USA born)	36	67.9	17	32.1	53	10.4
Other Spanish-speaking	14	77.8	4	22.2	18	3.5
Foreign-born Negro	9	45.0	11	55.0	20	3.9
Foreign-born White	6	60.0	4	40.0	10	2.0
Asian	10	83.3	2	16.7	12	2.4
Not ascertained	3	100.0	--	0.0	3	0.6
TOTALS	301	59.1	208	40.9	509	100.0

TABLE 13

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION AT QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	64	46.0	75	54.0	139	47.8
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	22	75.9	7	24.1	29	10.0
White (USA born)	46	59.7	31	40.3	77	26.5
Other Spanish-speaking	9	75.0	3	25.0	12	4.1
Foreign-born Negro	14	73.7	5	26.3	19	6.5
Foreign-born White	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	3.8
Asian	4	100.0	--	0.0	4	1.4
Not ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	168	57.7	123	42.3	291	100.0

TABLE 14

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION AT KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	57	44.9	70	55.1	127	47.3
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	28	66.7	14	33.3	42	15.7
White (USA born)	37	64.9	20	35.1	57	21.3
Other Spanish-speaking	5	41.7	7	58.3	12	4.5
Foreign-born Negro	7	43.8	9	56.2	116	6.0
Foreign-born White	5	45.5	6	54.5	11	4.1
Asian	--	0.0	3	100.0	3	1.1
Not ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	139	51.9	129	48.1	268	100.0

TABLE 15

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION AT MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	49	41.2	70	58.8	119	42.2
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	52	61.2	33	38.8	85	30.1
White (USA born)	28	75.7	9	24.3	37	13.1
Other Spanish-speaking	16	57.1	12	42.9	28	9.9
Foreign-born Negro	2	33.3	4	66.7	6	2.1
Foreign-born White	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	1.8
Asian	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	0.7
Not ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	151	53.5	131	46.5	282	100.0

TABLE 16

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION AT NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	56	43.8	72	56.2	128	37.8
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	41	51.3	39	48.7	80	23.6
White (USA born)	35	50.0	35	50.0	70	20.6
Other Spanish-speaking	7	43.8	9	56.2	16	4.7
Foreign-born Negro	6	31.6	13	68.4	19	5.6
Foreign-born White	12	66.7	6	33.3	18	5.3
Asian	2	25.0	6	75.0	8	2.4
Not ascertained	--	0.0	-	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	159	46.9	180	53.1	339	100.0

reflecting in part variations in the racial and national composition of the five boroughs.

Table 17 summarizes data on ethnic distribution by community colleges. The proportion of Negroes at Queensborough (54%) and Kingsborough (53%) is higher than at the other schools (mean for all schools = 47%), while the proportion of Puerto Ricans at the same two schools is lower than at other schools (14% at Queensborough and 20% at Kingsborough; mean for all schools = 30%). Bronx (12%) and Manhattan (15%) have fewer white students than other schools (mean for all schools = 21%), and almost equal proportions of Negroes (45% and 44%, respectively) and Spanish-speaking students (40% at both).

The male-female proportions for each school are shown in Table 18A. Although four colleges had more men than women, New York City had more women (53%) than men (47%). A statistical test indicated that the relative proportion of each sex differed among schools ($X^2 = 14.34$; df = 4, $p<.01$). In order to locate the specific differences between schools, the male-female ratio at each school was compared with that of every other school in chi square analyses. A statistically significant difference was found in the sex ratios between New York City and Bronx (Table 18B; $X^2 = 12.27$, df = 1, p.<.001), and between New York City and Queensborough ($X^2 = 7.36$, df = 1, $p<.01$). Excluding New York City, which had more females than males, all schools had similar male-female ratios.

Comparisons were also made of male-female ratios for each major ethnic group. Native-born Negroes had similar sex ratios

TABLE 17

ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Ethnic Group	Bronx		Queensborough		Kingsborough		Manhattan		New York City		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NEGRO (USA & foreign-born)	228	44.7	158	54.3	143	53.4	125	44.3	147	43.3	801	47.4
PUERTO RICAN & OTHER SPANISH SPEAKING	203	39.9	41	14.1	54	20.1	113	40.1	96	28.3	507	30.0
WHITE (USA & foreign-born)	63	12.4	88	30.2	68	25.4	42	14.9	88	26.0	349	20.7
ASIAN	12	2.4	4	1.4	3	1.1	2	0.7	8	2.4	29	1.7
NOT ASCERTAINED	3	0.6	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0	3	.2
TOTAL	509	100.0	291	100.0	268	100.0	282	100.0	339	100.0	1,689	100.0

TABLE 18A

SEX DISTRIBUTION BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	301	59.1	208	40.9	509
Queensborough	168	57.7	123	42.3	291
Kingsborough	139	51.9	129	48.1	268
Manhattan	151	53.5	131	46.5	282
New York City	159	46.9	180	53.1	339
TOTALS	918	54.4	771	45.6	1,689

$X^2 = 14.34$
df = 4
p< = .01

TABLE 18B

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR SEX DISTRIBUTION

	Bronx	Queens-borough	Kings-borough	Manhattan	New York City
Bronx	-	0.10	3.48	2.09	12.27****
Queensborough	0.10	-	1.71	0.85	7.36***
Kingsborough	3.48	1.71	-	0.10	1.47
Manhattan	2.09	0.85	0.10	-	2.72
New York City	12.27****	7.36***	1.47	2.72	-

***p<.01
****p<.001

in each of the schools (Table 19; $X^2 = 1.06$, df - 4, NS); there were slightly more females (55%) than males (45%). The sex ratios among USA-born whites was not as consistent (Table 20A). The ratio of males to females was greatest at Manhattn (3:1), followed by Bronx and Kingsborough (2:1), Queensborough (3:2), and New York City (1:1). Only Manhattan and New York City differed significantly in USA-born white sex ratios (Table 20B; $X^2 = 5.57$, df = 1, $p<.02$).

Among Puerto Ricans (Table 21A) the ratio of males to females approached 3:2. The male-female ratio was greatest at Queensborough (3:1), followed by Bronx and Kingsborough (2:1), Manhattan (3:2), and New York City (1:1). Table 21B shows New York City's sex distribution for Puerto Ricans was significantly different from that of both Bronx ($X^2 = 6.11$, df = 1, $p<.02$) and Queensborough ($X^2 = 4.32$, df = 1, $p<.05$). This matches our earlier finding for the overall sex distribution (see Table 10).

The sex ratio reversal which was found when overall sex differences were analyzed among schools seems to result primarily from differences between New York City and the other schools in the male-female ratio of USA-born whites and Puerto Ricans.

D. Ethnic and Sex Distribution in Each Entering Class at Each Community College

For each entering class, ethnic and sex distributions were presented for each of the CDP schools (Tables 22 to 38).

Tables 39A to 43C present the distributions of the three major ethnic groups in entering classes within each school. The proportion

TABLE 19

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE-BORN NEGROES BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	97	46.6	111	53.4	208
Queensborough	64	46.0	75	54.0	139
Kingsborough	57	44.9	70	55.1	127
Manhattan	49	41.2	70	58.8	119
New York City	56	43.8	72	56.2	128
TOTALS	323	44.8	398	55.2	721

$X^2 = 1.06$
df = 4
Not Significant

TABLE 20A

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE-BORN WHITES BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	36	67.9	17	32.1	53
Queensborough	46	59.7	31	40.3	77
Kingsborough	37	64.9	20	35.1	57
Manhattan	28	75.7	9	24.3	37
New York City	35	50.0	35	50.0	70
TOTALS	182	61.9	112	38.1	294

$X^2 = 8.37$
df = 4
$p < = .10$

TABLE 20B

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR SEX DISTRIBUTION OF NATIVE-BORN WHITES

	Bronx	Queensborough	Kingsborough	Manhattan	New York City
Bronx	-	0.59	0.02	0.32	3.27
Queensborough	0.59	-	0.19	2.13	1.04
Kingsborough	0.02	0.19	-	0.77	2.27
Manhattan	0.32	2.13	0.77	-	5.57*
New York City	3.27	1.04	2.27	5.57*	-

*$p<.02$

TABLE 21A

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF PUERTO RICANS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	Male		Female		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	126	68.1	59	31.9	185
Queensborough	22	75.9	7	24.1	29
Kingsborough	28	66.7	14	33.3	42
Manhattan	52	61.2	33	38.8	85
New York City	41	51.3	39	48.7	80
TOTALS	269	63.9	152	36.1	421

$X^2 = 9.18$
df = 4
p< = .10

TABLE 21B

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR SEX DISTRIBUTION OF PUERTO RICANS

	Bronx	Queens-borough	Kings-borough	Manhattan	New York City
Bronx	-	0.39	0.000005	0.96	6.11**
Queensborough	0.39	-	0.32	1.45	4.32*
Kingsborough	0.000005	0.32	-	0.17	2.07
Manhattan	0.96	1.45	0.17	-	1.27
New York City	6.11**	4.32*	2.07	1.37	

*p<.05

**p<.02

TABLE 22

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS AT BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	34	54.8	28	45.2	62	51.8
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	26	83.9	5	16.1	31	25.8
White (USA born)	13	81.2	3	18.7	16	13.3
Other Spanish-speaking	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	1.7
Foreign-born Negro	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	3.3
Foreign-born White	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	2.5
Asian	--	--	1	100.0	1	0.8
Not ascertained	1	100.0	--	--	1	0.8
TOTALS	79	65.8	41	34.2	120	100.0

TABLE 23

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS AT QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	26	47.3	29	52.7	55	49.5
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	7	53.8	6	46.2	13	11.7
White (USA born)	17	68.0	8	32.0	25	22.5
Other Spanish-speaking	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	3.6
Foreign-born Negro	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	7.2
Foreign-born White	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	4.5
Asian	1	100.0	--	--	1	0.9
Not ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTALS	63	56.8	48	44.2	111	100.0

TABLE 24

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS AT BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	18	35.3	33	64.7	51	36.4
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	37	63.8	21	36.2	58	41.4
White (USA born)	9	64.3	5	35.7	14	10.0
Other Spanish-speaking	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	3.5
Foreign-born Negro	2	30.0	4	70.0	6	4.2
Foreign-born White	1	100.0	--	--	1	0.7
Asian	3	100.0	--	--	3	2.1
Not ascertained	2	100.0	--	--	2	1.4
TOTALS	76	54.3	64	45.7	140	100.0

TABLE 25

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS AT QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	11	31.5	24	68.5	35	49.2
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	3	100.0	--	0.0	3	4.2
White (USA born)	7	27.0	19	73.0	26	36.6
Other Spanish-speaking	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	4.2
Foreign-born Negro	2	50.0	1	50.0	2	2.8
Foreign-born White	2	100.0	--	--	2	2.8
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Not Ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTALS	25	35.3	46	64.7	71	100.0

TABLE 26

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS AT KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	22	45.8	26	54.2	48	43.2
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	12	70.6	5	29.4	17	15.3
White (USA born)	17	56.7	13	43.3	30	27.0
Other Spanish-speaking	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	4.5
Foreign-born Negro	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	5.4
Foreign-born White	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	3.6
Asian	--	--	1	100.0	1	0.9
Not Ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTALS	60	54.1	51	45.9	111	100.0

TABLE 27

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS AT MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	21	40.4	31	59.6	52	50.0
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	16	66.7	8	33.3	24	23.1
White (USA born)	7	53.8	6	46.2	13	12.5
Other Spanish-speaking	6	54.5	5	45.5	11	10.6
Foreign-born Negro	1	33.3	2	66.7	3	2.9
Foreign-born White	1	100.0	--	--	1	0.9
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--
Not Ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTALS	52	50.0	52	50.0	104	100.0

√

TABLE 28

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS AT NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	13	39.4	20	60.6	33	32.0
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	14	58.3	10	41.7	24	23.3
White (USA born)	12	52.2	11	47.8	23	22.3
Other Spanish-speaking	1	100.0	--	--	1	0.9
Foreign-born Negro	2	28.6	5	71.4	7	6.8
Foreign-born White	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	9.7
Asian	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	4.9
Not Ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTALS	52	50.5	51	49.5	103	100.0

TABLE 29

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS AT BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	17	41.5	24	58.5	41	33.9
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	32	62.7	19	37.3	51	42.1
White (USA born)	5	45.5	6	54.5	11	9.1
Other Spanish-speaking	5	83.3	1	16.7	6	5.0
Foreign-born Negro	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	4.1
Foreign-born White	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	3.3
Asian	3	100.0	--	--	3	2.5
Not Ascertained	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTALS	68	56.2	53	43.8	121	100.0

TABLE 30

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS AT QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	12	57.1	9	42.9	21	42.9
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	4.1
White (USA born)	13	100.0	--	0.0	13	26.5
Other Spanish-speaking	3	100.0	--	0.0	3	6.1
Foreign-born Negro	5	100.0	--	0.0	5	10.2
Foreign-born White	3	100.0	--	0.0	3	6.1
Asian	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	4.1
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	40	81.7	9	18.3	49	100.0

TABLE 31

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS AT KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	20	38.5	32	61.5	52	50.5
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	9	64.3	5	35.7	14	13.6
White (USA born)	13	72.2	5	27.8	18	17.5
Other Spanish-speaking	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	4.9
Foreign-born Negro	4	50.0	4	50.0	8	7.8
Foreign-born White	1	20.0	4	80.0	5	4.9
Asian	--	0.0	1	100.0	1	0.9
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	49	47.6	54	52.4	103	100.0

TABLE 32

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS AT MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	19	41.3	27	58.7	46	45.5
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	20	64.5	11	35.5	31	30.7
White (USA born)	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	10.9
Other Spanish-speaking	4	44.4	5	55.6	9	8.9
Foreign-born Negro	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	1.9
Foreign-born White	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	1.9
Asian	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	54	53.5	47	46.5	101	100.0

TABLE 33

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS AT NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	25	48.1	27	51.9	52	44.1
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	13	50.0	13	50.0	26	22.0
White (USA born)	12	48.0	13	52.0	25	21.2
Other Spanish-speaking	1	25.0	3	75.0	4	3.4
Foreign-born Negro	1	16.7	5	83.3	6	5.1
Foreign-born White	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	1.7
Asian	--	0.0	3	100.0	3	2.5
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	53	44.9	65	55.1	118	100.0

TABLE 34

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS AT BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	28	51.9	26	48.1	54	42.2
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	31	68.9	14	31.1	45	35.2
White (USA born)	9	75.0	3	25.0	12	9.4
Other Spanish-speaking	3	60.0	2	40.0	5	3.9
Foreign-born Negro	2	40.0	3	60.0	5	3.9
Foreign-born White	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	3.9
Asian	4	80.0	1	20.0	5	3.9
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	78	60.9	50	39.1	128	100.0

TABLE 35

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS AT QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	15	53.6	13	46.4	28	46.7
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	10	90.9	1	9.1	11	18.3
White (USA born)	9	69.2	4	30.8	13	21.7
Other Spanish-speaking	2	100.0	--	0.0	2	3.3
Foreign-born Negro	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	6.7
Foreign-born White	1	100.0	--	0.0	1	1.7
Asian	1	100.0	--	0.0	1	1.7
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	40	66.7	20	33.3	60	100.0

TABLE 36

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS AT KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	15	55.6	12	44.4	27	50.0
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	7	63.6	4	36.4	11	20.4
White (USA born)	7	77.8	2	22.2	9	16.7
Other Spanish-speaking	--	0.0	2	100.0	2	3.7
Foreign-born Negro	--	0.0	2	100.0	2	3.7
Foreign-born White	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	3.7
Asian	--	0.0	--	100.0	1	1.9
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	30	55.6	24	44.4	54	100.0

TABLE 37

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS AT MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	9	42.9	12	57.1	21	28.9
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	16	53.3	14	46.7	30	36.8
White (USA born)	12	92.3	1	7.7	13	17.1
Other Spanish-speaking	6	75.0	2	25.0	8	10.5
Foreign-born Negro	--	0.0	1	100.0	1	1.3
Foreign-born White	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	2.6
Asian	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	2.6
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	45	58.4	32	41.6	77	100.0

TABLE 38

SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS AT NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

ETHNIC GROUP	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Negro (USA born)	18	41.9	25	58.1	43	36.4
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	14	46.7	16	53.3	30	25.4
White (USA born)	11	50.0	11	50.0	22	18.6
Other Spanish-speaking	5	45.5	6	54.5	11	9.3
Foreign-born Negro	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	5.1
Foreign-born White	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	5.1
Asian	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Not Ascertained	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
TOTALS	54	45.8	64	54.2	118	100.0

TABLE 39A

BRONX NEGROES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Negro		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1964	62	51.7	58	48.3	120
1965	51	36.4	89	63.6	140
1966	41	33.9	80	66.1	121
1967	54	42.2	74	57.8	128
TOTAL	208	40.9	301	59.1	509

$X^2 = 9.47$
df = 3
$p< = .05$

TABLE 39B

BRONX PUERTO RICANS vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Puerto Rican		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1964	31	25.8	89	74.2	120
1965	58	41.4	82	58.6	140
1966	51	42.1	70	57.9	121
1967	45	35.2	83	64.8	128
TOTAL	185	36.3	324	63.7	509

$X^2 = 9.13$
df = 3
$p< = .05$

TABLE 39C

BRONX WHITES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	White		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1964	16	13.3	104	86.7	120
1965	14	10.0	126	90.0	140
1966	11	9.1	110	90.9	121
1967	12	9.4	116	90.6	128
TOTAL	53	10.4	456	89.6	509

$X^2 = 1.50$
df = 3
Not Significant

TABLE 40A

QUEENSBOROUGH NEGROES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Negro		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1964	55	49.5	56	50.5	111
1965	35	49.3	36	50.7	71
1966	21	42.9	28	57.1	49
1967	28	46.7	32	53.3	60
TOTAL	139	47.8	152	52.2	291

$X^2 = 0.71$
df = 3
Not Significant

TABLE 40B

QUEENSBOROUGH PUERTO RICANS vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Puerto Rican		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1964	13	11.7	98	88.3	111
1965	3	4.2	68	95.8	71
1966	2	4.1	47	95.9	49
1967	11	18.3	49	81.7	60
TOTAL	29	10.0	262	90.0	291

$X^2 = 9.56$
df = 3
$p< = .05$

TABLE 40C

QUEENSBOROUGH WHITES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	White		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1964	25	22.5	86	77.5	111
1965	26	36.6	45	63.4	71
1966	13	26.5	36	73.5	49
1967	13	21.7	47	78.3	60
TOTAL	77	26.5	214	73.5	291

$X^2 = 5.36$
df = 3
$p< = .20$
Not Significant

TABLE 41A

KINGSBOROUGH NEGROES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Negro		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	48	43.2	63	56.8	111
1966	52	50.5	51	49.5	103
1967	27	50.0	27	50.0	54
TOTAL	127	47.4	141	52.6	268

$X^2 = 1.31$
df = 2
Not Significant

TABLE 41B

KINGSBOROUGH PUERTO RICANS vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Puerto Rican		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	17	15.3	94	84.7	111
1966	14	13.6	89	86.4	103
1967	11	20.4	43	79.6	54
TOTAL	42	15.7	226	84.3	268

$X^2 = 1.25$
df = 2
Not Significant

TABLE 41C

KINGSBOROUGH WHITES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	White		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	30	27.0	81	73.0	111
1966	18	17.5	85	82.5	103
1967	9	16.7	45	83.3	54
TOTAL	57	21.3	211	78.7	268

$X^2 = 3.77$
df = 2
$p< = .20$

TABLE 42A

MANHATTAN NEGROES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Negro		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	52	50.0	52	50.0	104
1966	46	45.5	55	54.5	101
1967	21	27.3	56	72.7	77
TOTAL	119	42.2	163	57.8	282

$X^2 = 10.09$
df = 2
p< = .01

TABLE 42B

MANHATTAN PUERTO RICANS vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Puerto Rican		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	24	23.1	80	76.9	104
1966	31	30.7	70	69.3	101
1967	30	39.0	47	61.0	77
TOTAL	85	30.1	197	69.9	282

$X^2 = 5.32$
df = 2
p< = .10

TABLE 42C

MANHATTAN WHITES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	White		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	13	12.5	91	87.5	104
1966	11	10.9	90	89.1	101
1967	13	16.9	64	83.1	77
TOTAL	37	13.1	245	86.9	282

$X^2 = 1.43$
df = 2
Not Significant

TABLE 43A

NEW YORK CITY NEGROES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Negro		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	33	32.0	70	68.0	103
1966	52	44.1	66	55.9	118
1967	43	36.4	75	63.6	118
TOTAL	128	37.8	211	62.2	339

$X^2 = 3.52$
df = 2
$p < = .20$

TABLE 43B

NEW YORK CITY PUERTO RICANS vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	Puerto Ricans		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	24	23.3	79	76.7	103
1966	26	22.0	92	78.0	118
1967	30	25.4	88	74.6	118
TOTAL	80	23.6	259	76.4	339

$X^2 = 0.38$
df = 2
Not Significant

TABLE 43C

NEW YORK CITY WHITES (USA BORN) vs ALL OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS BY ENTERING CLASS

	White		All Others		Total
	N	%	N	%	
1965	23	22.3	80	77.7	103
1966	25	21.2	93	78.8	118
1967	22	18.6	96	81.4	118
TOTAL	70	20.6	269	79.4	339

$X^2 = 0.49$
df = 2
Not Significant

of white students at Bronx Community College did not change from 1964 to 1967 (Table 39C). However, the proportions differ among Negroes (Table 39A; $X^2 = 9.47$, df = 3, $p<.05$) and Puerto Ricans (Table 39B; $X^2 = 9.13$, df = 3, $p<.05$). From 1964 to 1966, the proportion of Negroes tended to drop, while the proportion of Puerto Ricans tended to go up; however, in 1967, the trends for these two groups appeared to show a slight reversal.

In Queensborough, the percentage of whites and Negroes tended to remain at 26% and 47%, respectively (Tables 40C and 40A). On the other hand, the Puerto Rican enrollment showed a U-shaped trend (Table 40B), dropping from 12% in 1964 to 4% for two consecutive years, and rising again to 18% in 1967; these changes were statistically significant ($X^2 = 9.56$, df = 3, $p<.05$).

The other three colleges admitted their first CDP students in 1965. The ethnic distributions of both Kingsborough (Tables 41A to 41C) and New York City (Tables 43A to 43C) did not change from 1965 to 1967, but in Manhattan there was a drastic drop in enrollment of Negroes (Table 42A; $X^2 = 10.09$, df = 2, $p<.01$). The enrollment of approximately 50% Negroes in 1965 and 1966 dropped to 27% in 1967. In addition, the proportion of Puerto Ricans showed marginally significant increases (Table 42B; $X^2 = 5.32$, df = 2, $p<.10$), while the ratio of white students remained unchanged (Table 42C; $X^2 = 1.43$, df = 2, NS).

E. Comparison of Ethnic Distribution of College Discovery Program Students and CUNY Students

An ethnic survey conducted among registrants in the City University system in the Fall of 1967 showed that the majority of students in both the senior and community colleges was white (Table 44).[4] The high percentage of whites in community colleges (62%) contrasts with 21% white students in the CDP population. In addition, the percentage of Negro (10%) and Puerto Rican (3%) students in the total community college population is a great deal smaller than their representation in CDP (47% and 25%, respectively).[5]

The minority group make-up of colleges within each borough gives us an additional perspective on the differences between CDP students and other CUNY students. Comparisons will be made for the 1967 enrollment since this was the first year in which such data were collected from CUNY students.[6]

Senior colleges in the Borough of Manhattan have the smallest percentage of white students enrolled (Table 45), ranging from 79% at

---

[4] Report of the Fall, 1967 Undergraduate Ethnic Census. The City University of New York, Office of the Vice-Chancellor for the Executive Office, December, 1967.

[5] These figures are somewhat confounded since the CDP population was included in the ethnic survey and, therefore, entered into the sample statistics. A comparison of CDP with community colleges which excluded data from CDP students would yield an even greater ratio of minority student members in CDP relative to the senior and community college population.

[6] Comparisons were not made for the borough of Richmond since data for that borough were not available.

TABLE 44

ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION OF CUNY STUDENTS BY MATRICULATION STATUS AT SENIOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN 1967*

Group	Senior Colleges	Community Colleges	Total University
MATRICULATED STUDENTS[1]			
White	90.4	74.9	87.1
Negro	3.6	13.3	5.8
Puerto Rican	1.6	5.5	2.4
Others	3.6	4.7	3.0
Not ascertained	0.7	1.5	0.9
TOTAL	99.9	99.9	100.1
NON-MATRICULATED STUDENTS[2]			
White	78.2	60.9	71.4
Negro	13.4	27.4	18.9
Puerto Rican	2.9	5.2	3.8
Others	4.4	4.7	4.5
Not ascertained	1.1	1.8	1.4
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
ALL STUDENTS[3]			
White	87.0	68.2	81.8
Negro	6.4	20.1	10.2
Puerto Rican	1.9	5.4	2.9
Others	3.8	4.7	4.1
Not ascertained	0.8	1.6	1.1
TOTAL	99.9	100.0	100.1

---

*Data from Report of the Fall, 1967 Undergraduate Ethnic Census, The City University of New York, Office of the Vice-Chancellor for the Executive Office, December, 1967. Data expressed in percentages.

[1] Based on 87.4% sample
[2] Based on 85.4% sample
[3] Based on 86.7% sample

TABLE 45

ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION OF CUNY STUDENTS FOR COLLEGES IN MANHATTAN FOR 1967*

	Manhattan Community College C. D. P.	Manhattan Community College	City-Baruch	City-Uptown	Hunter-Park	John Jay College
White	19.7	61.2	79.3	81.5	83.9	84.7
Negro	30.2	21.9	11.1	8.4	8.0	12.2
Puerto Rican	36.8	8.5	4.2	3.0	2.4	1.9
Other	13.1	7.2	4.8	6.0	4.8	0.9
Not Ascertained	____	1.2	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.4
TOTAL	99.8	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1

*Data expressed in percentages.

Baruch to 85% at Jay. This compared to 92% white enrollment at Queens College (Table 46) and Brooklyn College (Table 47), and 88% white enrollment at Hunter College Bronx (now Lehman College Table 48) and York College Table 46. White enrollments at community colleges range from 85% at Queensborough to 54% at Bronx, while Kingsborough has 84%, Manhattan has 61% and New York City, 57%. The white enrollment in CDP in 1967 never exceeded 25% at any school. New York City CDP had 24% whites, while Queensborough had 23%, Kingsborough and Manhattan had 20%, and Bronx had 13% white enrollment.

In senior and community colleges, the majority of non-whites was Negro. Twelve percent of the students at Jay and 11% at Baruch were Negro; this compares with 4% of the student body at Hunter College Bronx (Lehman College), Queens College, and Brooklyn College. The community colleges with the largest Negro percentages were Bronx and New York City, both with approximately 29%, while Kingsborough had only an 8% Negro enrollment. In the CDP programs, Queensborough and Kingsborough enrolled slightly more than 50% Negroes, while Manhattan had the smallest percentage of Negroes, 30%.

Puerto Ricans constituded 10% or less of the population in all senior and community colleges. Bronx Community College had a 10% Puerto Rican enrollment, while Queensborough, Queens College and Brooklyn College had fewer than 1%. Manhattan and Bronx CDP had Puerto Rican enrollments of slightly more than 35%, while Queensborough was lowest with 18% Puerto Rican enrollment.

These figures indicate that CDP is accomplishing its mission of providing minority group members with college experience.

TABLE 46

ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION OF CUNY STUDENTS FOR COLLEGES IN QUEENS FOR 1967*

	Queensborough Community College C.D.P.	Queensborough Community College	Queens College	York College
White	23.4	84.9	91.6	88.3
Negro	53.4	10.3	4.1	5.4
Puerto Rican	18.3	0.9	0.5	2.5
Other	5.0	2.6	2.9	3.8
Not Ascertained	--	1.4	0.9	0.0
TOTAL	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.0

*Data expressed in percentages.

TABLE 47

ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION OF CUNY STUDENTS FOR COLLEGES IN BROOKLYN FOR 1967*

	Kingsborough Community College C.D.P.	New York City Community College C.D.P.	Kingsborough Community College	New York City Community College	Brooklyn College
White	20.4	23.7	83.7	56.8	91.6
Negro	53.7	41.5	7.9	29.7	4.2
Puerto Rican	20.4	25.4	2.4	6.1	0.8
Other	5.6	9.3	3.4	5.8	2.4
Not Ascertained	--	--	2.6	1.6	1.1
TOTAL	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.1

*Data expressed in percentages.

TABLE 48

ETHNIC GROUP DISTRIBUTION OF CUNY STUDENTS FOR COLLEGES IN THE BRONX 1967*

	Bronx Community College C. D. P.	Bronx Community College	Hunter-Bronx
White	13.3	53.9	88.4
Negro	46.1	28.9	4.5
Puerto Rican	35.2	10.1	2.7
Other	7.8	5.0	4.0
Not Ascertained	--	2.1	0.4
TOTAL	102.4	100.0	100.0

*Data expressed in percentages.

III. Performance in High School, Community College and Senior College Experience

The following analyses are of the high school performance of College Discovery Program students, their performance in CDP, and their senior college performance. The analyses have been divided into two major sections: one dealing with an analysis of the students' high school diplomas and high school averages, and the other dealing with graduates from the community colleges who have gone on to senior college.

A. High School Diplomas: 1964 to 1967

Table 49 shows that almost 75% of the 1,689 CDP admissions had academic diplomas. Each of the four other types of diplomas accounted for less than 10% of the total CDP population as follows: general (9%), vocational (7%), commercial (6%), and technical (4%). The percentages of the various kinds of high school diplomas have remained relatively constant from 1964 to 1967. Over the four year period from 1964 to 1967 all schools received approximately equal percentages of students with academic diplomas; almost 75% had academic diplomas (Table 50). Queensborough received the largest percentage of students with vocational (12%) and technical (7%) diplomas, while Manhattan received the largest percentage of general (12%) and commercial (11%) diplomates. Queensborough had the smallest percentage of general diplomates (6%), with Manhattan lowest on vocational diplomates (4%), Bronx and Kingsborough lowest on commercial diplomates (3%) and New York City and Manhattan lowest on technical diplomats (1%).

TABLE 49

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY ENTERING CLASS

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1964	156	68.0	15	6.5	25	10.8	16	6.9	19	8.2	231	100.0
1965	391	73.9	44	8.3	43	8.1	32	6.0	19	3.6	529	100.0
1966	363	73.8	33	6.7	52	10.6	29	5.9	15	3.0	492	100.0
1967	344	78.7	29	6.6	30	6.9	20	4.6	14	3.2	437	100.0
GRAND TOTAL	1254	74.2	121	7.2	150	8.9	97	5.7	67	4.0	1689	100.0

TABLE 50

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bronx	376	73.9	38	7.5	48	9.4	17	3.3	30	5.9	509	100.0
Queensborough	201	69.1	35	12.0	16	5.5	18	6.2	21	7.2	291	100.0
Kingsborough	209	78.0	14	5.2	28	10.4	9	3.4	8	3.0	268	100.0
Manhattan	201	71.3	11	3.9	34	12.1	32	11.3	4	1.4	282	100.0
New York City	267	78.8	23	6.8	24	7.1	21	6.2	4	1.2	339	100.0
TOTAL	1254	74.2	121	7.2	150	8.9	97	5.7	67	4.0	1689	100.0

Tables 51A to 55A compare the high school diplomas that were held by students at each school for each year of the CDP program. The distributions of high school diplomas held by students who entered Bronx each year are shown in Table 51. There is a significant difference between the distribution of high school diplomas in the Bronx and that of all other CDP schools. (Table 51B; $X^2 = 14.50$, df = 4, $p<.01$). The differences are primarily due to the high percentage of technical diplomas and low percentage of commercial diplomas in Bronx.

Queensborough showed great changes in the distribution of diplomas held by its CDP students (Table 52A). Queensborough tended to have a lower pecentage of academic students (70%) and a higher percentage of vocational and technical students (12% and 7% respectively) than other colleges. This difference between Queensborough and other schools is statistically significant (Table 52B; $X^2 = 26.88$, df = 4, $p<.001$).

Kingsborough received a smaller percentage of non-academic diploma students each year (Table 53A). However, the distribution of high school diplomas at Kingsborough is not significantly different from that of other CDP schools for the 1965-1967 period (Table 53B; $X^2 = 6.50$, df = 4, NS).

Manhattan maintained a relatively stable distribution of high school diplomas each year, with the exception that 1967 showed a decrease in percentage of general diploma holders and elimination of an otherwise small percentage of technical diploma students (Table 54A). The distribution of high school diplomas held by Manhattan's students is significantly different from that of other CDP schools (Table 54B; $X^2 = 36.00$, df = 4, $p<.001$).

TABLE 51A

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY ENTERING CLASS AT BRONX

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1964	81	67.5	8	6.7	17	14.2	4	3.3	10	8.3	120	100.0
1965	109	77.9	14	10.0	8	5.7	5	3.6	4	2.9	140	100.0
1966	84	69.4	8	6.6	16	13.2	5	4.1	8	6.6	121	100.0
1967	102	79.7	8	6.2	7	5.5	3	2.3	8	6.2	128	100.0
TOTAL	376	73.8	38	7.5	48	9.4	17	3.3	30	5.9	509	100.0

TABLE 51B

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AT BRONX vs ALL OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bronx	376	73.8	38	7.5	48	9.4	17	3.3	30	5.9	509	100.0
All Others	878	74.4	83	7.0	102	8.6	80	6.8	37	3.1	1180	99.9

$X^2 = 14.50$
df = 4
p< = .01

TABLE 52A

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY ENTERING CLASS AT QUEENSBOROUGH

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1964	75	67.6	7	6.3	8	7.2	12	10.8	9	8.1	111	100.0
1965	55	77.5	6	8.5	2	2.8	4	5.6	4	5.6	71	100.0
1966	28	57.1	14	28.6	4	8.2	-	-	3	6.1	49	100.0
1967	43	71.7	8	13.3	2	3.3	2	3.3	5	8.3	60	100.0
TOTAL	201	69.6	35	12.0	16	5.5	18	6.2	21	7.2	291	100.0

TABLE 52B

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AT QUEENSBOROUGH vs ALL OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bronx	201	69.6	35	12.0	16	5.5	18	6.2	21	7.2	291	100.0
All Others	1053	75.3	86	6.2	134	9.6	79	5.6	46	3.3	1398	100.0

$X^2 = 26.88$
df = 4
$p < = .001$

TABLE 53A

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY ENTERING CLASS AT KINGSBOROUGH

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	77	69.4	10	9.0	15	13.5	4	3.6	5	4.5	111	100.0
1966	87	84.5	3	2.9	7	6.8	4	3.6	5	1.9	103	100.0
1967	45	83.3	1	1.9	6	11.1	1	1.9	1	1.9	54	100.0
TOTAL	209	78.0	14	5.2	28	10.4	9	3.4	8	3.0	268	100.0

TABLE 53B

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AT KINGSBOROUGH vs ALL OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kingsborough	209	78.0	14	5.2	28	10.4	9	3.4	8	3.0	268	100.0
All Others	889	74.7	92	7.7	97	8.2	72	6.1	40	3.4	1190	100.1

$X^2 = 6.50$
df = 4
Not Significant

TABLE 54A

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY ENTERING CLASS AT MANHATTAN

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	76	73.1	5	4.8	13	12.5	8	7.7	2	1.9	104	100.0
1966	66	65.3	3	3.0	15	14.9	15	14.9	2	2.0	101	100.0
1967	59	76.6	3	3.9	6	7.8	9	11.7	--	--	77	100.0
TOTAL	201	71.3	11	3.9	34	12.1	32	11.3	4	1.4	282	100.0

TABLE 54B

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AT MANHATTAN vs ALL OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Manhattan	201	71.3	11	3.9	34	12.1	32	11.3	4	1.4	282	100.0
All Others	897	76.3	95	8.1	91	7.7	49	4.2	44	3.7	1176	100.0

$X^2 = 36.00$
df = 4
p< = .001

TABLE 55A

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY ENTERING CLASS AT NEW YORK CITY

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	74	71.9	9	8.7	5	4.9	11	10.7	4	3.9	103	100.0
1966	98	83.0	5	4.2	10	8.5	5	4.2	-	-	118	100.0
1967	95	80.5	9	7.6	9	7.6	5	4.2	-	-	118	100.0
TOTAL	267	78.8	23	6.8	24	7.1	21	6.2	4	1.2	339	100.0

TABLE 55B

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS AT NEW YORK CITY vs ALL OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGES

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New York City	267	78.8	23	6.8	24	7.1	21	6.2	4	1.2	339	100.0
All Others	831	74.3	83	7.4	101	9.0	60	5.4	44	3.9	1119	100.0

$X^2 = 8.30$
df = 4
p< = .10

New York City (Table 55A) received a smaller percentage of non-academic diplomates (21%) than any other school, and the difference reached marginal significance. (Table 55B; $X^2 = 8.30$, df = 4, $p<.10$).

B. High School Diplomas and Grade Point Averages For Each Community College

Tables 56 to 59 present the types of high school diplomas held by CDP students within each of the community colleges and, where available, their high school averages.

In 1964, Bronx and Queensborough, the two original CDP programs, had an almost identical distribution of high school diplomas. Table 56 shows that two-thirds of the entering students had academic diplomas, while general, technical, commercial and vocational diplomas, in that order, accounted for the rest. The two schools did not differ in the ratio of academic to non-academic diplomas (Table 60; $X^2 = 0.02$, df = 1, NS). Analyses of averages were not possible since high school grades were unavailable for this initial class.

In 1965 (Table 57), the ratio of academic to non-academic diplomas increased slightly to favor academic diplomas. Comparing enrollment only at Bronx and Queensborough, the shift to a greater percentage of academic diplomas in 1965 was significant (Table 61; $X^2 = 5.23$, df = 1, $p<.05$). The relative frequency of the various diplomas were as follows: vocational (8%), general (8%), commercial (6%) and technical (4%). None of the non-academic diplomas accounted for more than ten percent of this entering class, and the ratio of academic to non-academic diplomas was very similar for all five colleges (Table 62; $X^2 = 3.04$, df = 4, NS).

TABLE 56

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS*

	Academic		Vocational		General		Commercial		Technical		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bronx	81	67.5	8	6.7	17	14.2	4	3.3	10	8.3	120	100.0
Queens-borough	75	67.6	7	6.3	8	7.2	12	10.8	9	8.1	111	100.0
TOTAL	156	67.6	15	6.5	25	10.8	16	6.9	19	8.2	231	100.0

*High School Averages were unavailable for the 1964 population.

TABLE 57

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA AND AVERAGE BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC			VOCATIONAL			GENERAL			COMMERCIAL			TECHNICAL			T O T A L		
	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.*	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%**	MEAN G.P.A.
Bronx	109	77.8	75.4^{a}	14	10.0	83.3^{d}	8	5.7	73.4	5	3.6	73.6^{h}	4	2.8	73.3^{j}	140	99.9	75.7^{l}
Queensborough	55	77.4	74.2	6	8.4	83.4	2	2.8	73.4	4	5.6	75.7^{i}	4	5.6	71.6	71	99.8	74.9^{m}
Kingsborough	77	69.4	74.6^{b}	10	9.0	79.8	15	13.5	71.9^{f}	4	3.6	77.2	5	4.5	78.9	111	100.0	75.1^{n}
Manhattan	76	73.1	75.1	5	4.8	78.6	13	12.5	73.2^{g}	8	7.7	74.1	2	1.9	74.1^{k}	104	100.0	74.9^{o}
New York City	74	71.8	76.0^{c}	9	8.7	76.3^{e}	5	4.8	73.3	11	10.7	75.4	4	3.9	75.5	103	99.9	75.8^{p}
T O T A L S	391	73.9	75.1	44	8.3	80.6	43	8.1	72.8	32	6.0	75.1	19	3.6	75.0	529	99.9	75.3

*N reduced by missing information as indicated: High School did not report overall grade average - Students had received credit but no grade.

$^{a}N = 107$
$^{b}N = 72$
$^{c}N = 73$
$^{d}N = 10$
$^{e}N = 8$
$^{f}N = 13$
$^{g}N = 12$
$^{h}N = 4$
$^{i}N = 3$
$^{j}N = 3$
$^{k}N = 1$
$^{l}N = 132$
$^{m}N = 70$
$nN = 104$
$^{o}N = 102$
$pN = 99$

**Percentages may not equal 100.0% because of rounding.

TABLE 58

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA AND AVERAGE BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC			VOCATIONAL			GENERAL			COMMERCIAL			TECHNICAL			T O T A L		
	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.*	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%**	MEAN G.P.A.
Bronx	84	69.4	74.5^a	8	6.6	83.1	16	13.2	72.7^d	5	4.1	78.1	8	6.6	76.8	121	99.9	75.2^e
Queensborough	28	57.1	73.2^b	14	28.6	80.4	4	8.2	69.6	0	0.0	--	3	6.1	75.2	49	100.0	75.1^f
Kingsborough	87	84.5	72.5^c	3	2.9	85.2	7	6.8	70.7	4	3.9	77.6	2	1.9	77.0	103	100.0	73.0^g
Manhattan	66	65.3	73.6	3	3.0	83.6	15	14.9	72.6	15	14.9	78.3	2	2.0	81.5	101	100.1	74.6
New York City	98	83.1	73.6	5	4.2	76.4	10	8.5	73.6	5	4.2	86.1	0	0.0	--	118	100.0	74.3
TOTALS	363	73.8	73.5	33	6.7	81.2	52	10.6	72.3	29	5.9	79.5	15	3.0	77.1	492	100.0	74.4

*N reduced by missing information as indicated: High School did not report overall grade average - Students had received credit but no grade.

^aN = 79
^bN = 27
^cN = 85
^dN = 14

^eN = 114
^fN = 48
^gN = 101

**Percentages may not equal 100.0% because of rounding.

TABLE 59

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA AND AVERAGE BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC			VOCATIONAL			GENERAL			COMMERCIAL			TECHNICAL			T O T A L		
	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.*	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%	MEAN G.P.A.	N	%**	MEAN G.P.A.
Bronx	102	79.7	73.9^a	8	6.3	82.4	7	5.5	69.5	3	2.3	75.9	8	6.3	72.7	128	100.1	74.2^d
Queensborough	43	71.7	74.0	8	13.3	78.5	2	3.3	67.9	2	3.3	70.4	5	8.3	79.7	60	99.9	73.6
Kingsborough	45	83.0	74.4^b	1	1.9	69.1	6	11.3	71.9	1	1.9	71.2	1	1.9	74.1	54	100.0	74.0^e
Manhattan	59	76.6	74.2	3	3.9	79.4	6	7.8	74.6	9	11.7	77.6	0.	0.0	--	77	100.0	74.8
New York City	95	80.5	74.6^c	9	7.6	82.4	9	7.6	72.8	5	4.2	82.9	0	0.0	--	118	99.9	75.4^f
T O T A L S	344	78.7	74.2	29	6.6	80.6	30	6.9	71.9	20	4.6	77.6	14	3.2	75.3	437	100.0	74.5

*N reduced by missing information as indicated: High School did not report overall grade average - Students had received credit but no grade.

$^aN = 99$

$^bN = 43$

$^cN = 90$

$^dN = 125$

$^eN = 52$

$^fN = 113$

**Percentages may not equal 100.0% because of rounding.

TABLE 60

ACADEMIC vs ALL OTHER DIPLOMAS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC		ALL OTHERS		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	81	67.5	39	32.5	120
Queensborough	75	67.6	36	32.4	111
TOTAL	156	67.5	75	32.5	231

$X^2 = 0.02$

df = 1

Not Significant

TABLE 61

ACADEMIC vs ALL OTHER DIPLOMAS FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES

	ACADEMIC		ALL OTHERS		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1964	156	67.5	75	32.5	231	100.0
1965	164	77.7	47	22.3	211	100.0
TOTAL	320	72.4	122	27.6	442	100.0

$X^2 = 5.23$

df = 1

$p < = .05$

TABLE 62

ACADEMIC vs ALL OTHER DIPLOMAS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC		ALL OTHERS		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	109	77.9	31	22.1	140
Queensborough	55	77.5	16	22.5	71
Kingsborough	77	69.4	34	30.6	111
Manhattan	76	73.1	28	26.9	104
New York City	74	71.8	29	28.2	103
TOTAL	391	73.9	138	26.1	529

$X^2 = 3.05$

df = 4

Not Significant

Table 57 includes mean averages, where available, for each type of diploma in each school. The range of averages for academic diplomas is extremely small, with New York City showing the highest mean (76.0), and Queensborough, the lowest (74.2). As might be expected of such a small range of scores, an analysis of variance of mean averages among the five schools did not yield a significant difference (Table 63). This entering class had an average grade of 75.

In 1966, academic diplomas continued to be held by more than seventy percent of all entering students. (Table 58). However, there was some variation from the prior year in the distribution of other' kinds of diplomas: general (10%), vocational (9%), commercial (5%) and technical (3%). Table 64 shows that the ratio of academic to non-academic diplomas was not the same in each school ($X^2 = 23.24$, df = 4, $p<.001$). Chi square values and significance levels for comparisons between schools are shown in Table 65. Kingsborough and New York City received a greater percentage of academic diploma graduates than the other schools, accounting for almost 85% of their entering students. On the other hand, Queensborough, Manhattan, and Bronx had a lower percentage of academic diplomas than the other schools. Queensborough accepted a far higher percentage of students with vocational diplomas than any other schools, Manhattan accepted a greater percentage of students with general and commercial diplomas, and Bronx accepted a high percentage of students with commercial diplomas.

An analysis of variance (Table 66) comparing the mean high

TABLE 63

MEAN HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

Mean High School Averages

College	N	Mean Average
Bronx	109	75.4
Queensborough	55	74.2
Kingsborough	77	74.6
Manhattan	76	75.1
New York City	74	76.0

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Schools	168.49	4	42.12	2.71	NS
Within Schools	5986.05	386	15.51		
TOTAL	6154.54	390	15.78		

TABLE 64

ACADEMIC vs ALL OTHER DIPLOMAS
BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC		ALL OTHERS		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	84	69.4	37	30.6	121
Queensborough	28	57.1	21	42.9	49
Kingsborough	87	84.5	16	15.5	103
Manhattan	66	65.3	35	34.7	101
New York City	98	83.2	20	17.0	111
TOTAL	363	73.8	129	26.2	492

$X^2 = 23.24$

df = 4

p< = .001

TABLE 65

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR ACADEMIC vs ALL OTHER DIPLOMAS FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS

	Bronx	Queens- borough	Kings- borough	Manhattan	N.Y.C.
Bronx	--	1.82	6.16**	0.25	5.38*
Queensborough	1.82	--	12.01****	0.63	11.19****
Kingsborough	6.16**	12.01****	--	8.94***	0.01
Manhattan	0.25	0.63	8.94***	--	8.15***
New York City	5.38*	11.19****	0.01	8.15***	--

*p< .05
**p< .02
***p< .01
****p< .001

123.77***

TABLE 66

MEAN HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1966 ENTERING CLASS

Mean High School Averages

College	Mean Average
Bronx	74.5
Queensborough	73.2
Kingsborough	72.5
Manhattan	73.6
New York City	73.6

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Schools	159.44	4	39.86	2.33	NS
Within Schools	6112.19	358	17.07		
TOTAL	6271.63	362	17.32		

school averages of students who entered in 1966 showed no significant differences among schools. The mean averages for all five schools clustered around 74, a small reduction from the previous year.

In 1967 (Table 59), a slightly greater proportion of students holding academic diplomas were admitted than in previous years. Almost eighty percent of the entering students had academic diplomas. The other diplomas were general (7%), vocational (7%), commercial (5%) and technical (3%). The proportion of academic diploma recipients was similar in each school (Table 67). Kingsborough again had the highest percentage of academic diplomas (83%), while Queensborough had the lowest percentage of academic diplomas (72%).

Comparing the high school averages of 1967 students by an analysis of variance showed no significant differences between schools (Table 68). The mean high school average was approximately 74.

TABLE 67

ACADEMIC vs ALL OTHER DIPLOMAS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC		ALL OTHERS		TOTAL
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	102	79.7	26	20.3	128
Queensborough	43	71.7	17	28.3	60
Kingsborough	45	83.3	9	16.7	54
Manhattan	59	76.6	18	23.4	77
New York City	95	80.5	23	19.5	118
TOTAL	344	78.7	93	21.3	437

$X^2 = 2.97$

df = 4

Not Significant

TABLE 68

MEAN HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1967 ENTERING CLASS

Mean High School Averages

College	Mean Average
Bronx	73.9
Queensborough	74.0
Kingsborough	74.4
Manhattan	74.2
New York City	74.6

Analysis of Variance

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Schools	29.24	4	7.31	0.44	NS
Within Schools	5540.07	338	16.39		
TOTAL	5569.31		16.28		

IV. High School Diplomas and Graduation from the College Discovery Program

The previous discussion presented the high school diplomas and academic characteristics of students entering CDP. We will now investigate the relationship of high school diplomas to subsequent graduation from Community College.

Table 69 presents the number and percentage of graduates of the 1964 CDP class. Overall, twenty-three percent of the 1964 class eventually graduated from CDP. Twenty-seven percent of the Bronx students and eighteen percent of the Queensborough students graduated by January, 1968.[7] The most successful students were those who held technical diplomas (42% graduated), followed by commercial (38%) and academic and vocational diplomas (22% and 20%). Students who held general diplomas had the lowest percentage of graduates (4%).

Among those who held academic diplomas, there was no difference in percentage of graduates from Bronx or Queensborough (Table 70; $X^2 = 0.11$, df = 1, NS). Because of the relatively small number of students involved, all non-academic diploma categories were combined to see whether Bronx and Queensborough differed in proportion of these diploma graduates; the statistical test of this difference approaches but does not quite reach significance.

---

[7] It should be noted that shortage of space caused premature termination for many Queensborough students who might otherwise have continued.

TABLE 69

GRADUATION FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC			VOCATIONAL			GENERAL			COMMERCIAL			TECHNICAL			T O T A L*		
	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad
Bronx	81	19	23.5	8	2	25.0	17	1	5.9	4	3	75.0	10	7	70.0	120	32	26.7
Queensborough	75	15	20.0	7	1	14.3	8	-	-	12	3	25.0	9	1	11.1	111	20	18.0
T O T A L	156	34	21.8	15	3	20.0	25	1	4.0	16	6	37.5	19	8	42.1	231	52	22.5

*One Student was registered for courses in Spring, 1968; this student was classified as a non-graduate.

TABLE 70

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATES vs NON-GRADUATES FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS WITH ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS

	Graduates		Non-Graduates		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	19	23.5	62	76.5	81
Queensborough	15	20.0	60	80.0	75
TOTAL	34	21.8	122	78.2	156

$X^2 = 0.11$

df = 1

Not Significant

Table 72 presents the percentage of graduates with academic and non-academic diplomas combined. The difference between Bronx and Queensborough does not reach significance.

Five hundred and twenty-nine students entered in 1965, and 150 (28%) graduated by January, 1968 (Table 73). A higher percentage of those holding technical diplomas graduated (42%) than those holding other high school diplomas. The percentage of graduates for the other diplomas were academic (31%), commercial (25%), vocational (18%) and general (12%). New York City had the highest percentage of graduates (54%), followed by Manhattan (29%), Kingsborough (26%), Bronx (19%) and Queensborough (11%).[8] Fifty-two non-graduates enrolled in community college in spring, 1968.

Table 74 shows a highly significant difference among schools in proportion of graduates holding academic diplomas ($X^2 = 43.76$, df = 4, $p<.01$). For non-academic diploma recipients, the proportion of graduates was significantly different among schools (Table 75; $X^2 = 10.21$, df - 4, $p<.02$). Table 76 presents the graduates for both academic and non-academic diplomas combined. Chi square values and significance levels for comparisons between schools are shown in Table 77. It was found that New York City had a significantly higher proportion of graduates than all other schools, while Queensborough had a significantly lower proportion of graduates than all schools but Bronx.

---

8. On students' grade reports, New York City disregarded F's that were made up by a passing grade, and D's that were made up by a higher grade. No other school followed this practice.

TABLE 71

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATES vs NON-GRADUATES FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS WITH NON-ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS

	Graduates		Non-Graduates		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	13	33.3	26	66.7	39
Queensborough	5	13.9	31	86.1	36
TOTAL	18	24.0	57	76.0	75

$X^2 = 2.89$

df = 1

p< = .10

TABLE 72

TOTAL GRADUATES vs NON-GRADUATES BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	Graduates		Non-Graduates*		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	32	26.7	88	73.3	120
Queensborough	20	18.0	91	82.0	111
T O T A L	52	22.5	179	77.5	231

$X^2 = 2.00$

df = 1

p< = .20

---

*One student registered for Community College in Spring, 1968; the rest are no longer attending.

TABLE 73

GRADUATION FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	ACADEMIC			VOCATIONAL			GENERAL			COMMERCIAL			TECHNICAL			T O T A L*		
	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad
Bronx	109	22	20.2	14	2	14.3	8	1	12.5	5	-	-	4	2	50.0	140	27	19.3
Queensborough	55	8	14.5	6	-	-	2	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	-	71	8	11.3
Kingsborough	77	23	29.9	10	1	10.0	15	-	-	4	3	75.0	5	2	40.0	111	29	26.1
Manhattan	76	23	30.3	5	1	20.0	13	3	23.1	8	2	25.0	2	1	50.0	104	30	28.8
New York City	74	45	60.8	9	4	44.4	5	1	20.0	11	3	27.3	4	3	75.0	103	56	54.4
T O T A L	391	121	30.9	44	8	18.2	43	5	11.6	32	8	25.0	19	8	42.1	529	150	28.4

*52 Students were registered for courses in Spring, 1968; these students were classified as non-graduates.

TABLE 74

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATES vs NON-GRADUATES FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS WITH ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS

	Graduates		Non-Graduates		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	22	20.2	87	79.8	109
Queensborough	8	14.5	47	85.5	5
Kingsborough	23	29.9	54	70.1	77
Manhattan	23	30.3	53	69.7	76
New York City	45	60.8	29	39.2	74
TOTAL	121	30.9	270	69.1	391

$X^2 = 43.76$

df = 4

$p< = .001$

TABLE 75

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATES vs NON-GRADUATES FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS WITH NON-ACADEMIC DIPLOMAS

	Graduates		Non-Graduates		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	5	16.1	26	83.9	31
Queensborough	--	--	16	100.0	16
Kingsborough	6	25.0	21	75.0	28
Manhattan	7	25.0	21	75.0	28
New York City	11	37.9	18	62.1	29
TOTAL	29	21.0	109	79.0	138

$X^2 = 10.21$

$df = 4$

$p < = .02$

TABLE 76

TOTAL GRADUATES vs NON-GRADUATES BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	Graduates		Non-Graduates*		Total
	N	%	N	%	
Bronx	27	19.3	113	80.7	140
Queensborough	8	11.3	63	88.7	71
Kingsborough	29	26.1	82	73.9	111
Manhattan	30	28.8	74	71.2	104
New York City	56	54.4	47	45.6	103
TOTAL	150	28.4	379	71.6	529

$X^2 = 50.48$

df = 4

p< = .001

---

*52 of these students registered for Community College in Spring, 1968; the rest are no longer attending.

TABLE 77

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR COMPARISONS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR TOTAL GRADUATES vs NON-GRADUATES FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	Bronx	Queens-borough	Kings-borough	Manhattan	N.Y.C.
Bronx	--	1.65	1.30	2.54	30.94***
Queensborough	1.65	--	5.02*	7.67**	33.58***
Kingsborough	1.30	5.02*	--	.20	17.80***
Manhattan	2.54	7.67**	.20	--	13.88***
New York City	30.94***	33.58***	17.80***	13.88***	--

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

When CDP entrants of the first two years are combined (Table 78), the superiority of students with technical degrees becomes clearer. Forty-two percent eventually graduate community college; a high graduation rate for technical dimplomates is shown at all schools but Queensborough. Slightly less than 30% of students entering with commercial and academic diplomas graduate, vocational diplomas follow with slightly less than 20% graduating, and fewer than 10% of the students with general diplomas complete their studies.

Students holding academic diplomas generally constituted more than 70% of the 1964 and 1965 CDP entering classes. Their relatively mediocre showing, especially considering their pre-college preparation, deserves further study, as does the impressive success of technical diploma recipients.

TABLE 78

GRADUATION FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968
BY HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	ACADEMIC			VOCATIONAL			GENERAL			COMMERCIAL			TECHNICAL			T O T A L		
	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad	Ent	Grad	% Grad
Bronx	190	41	21.6	22	4	18.2	25	2	8.0	9	3	33.3	14	9	64.3	260	59	22.7
Queensborough	130	23	17.7	13	1	7.7	10	-	-	16	3	18.8	13	1	7.7	182	28	15.4
Kingsborough	77	23	29.9	10	1	10.0	15	-	-	4	3	75.0	5	2	40.0	111	29	26.1
Manhattan	76	23	30.3	5	1	20.0	13	3	23.1	8	2	25.0	2	1	50.0	104	30	28.8
New York City	74	45	60.8	9	4	44.4	5	1	20.0	11	3	27.3	4	3	75.0	103	56	54.4
T O T A L	547	155	28.3	59	11	18.6	68	6	8.8	48	14	29.2	38	16	42.1	760	202	26.6

V. College Discovery Program Graduates

The next section is concerned with the experiences of College Discovery Program students after they leave the program.

A. Enrollment in Senior College

The number and percentage of College Discovery Program graduates of the 1964 and 1965 classes who entered senior college as of Spring, 1968 is shown in Table 79. The overall rate of entrance into senior college is 88 percent. Queensborough shows the highest rate of entrance into senior college (100%), while New York City shows the lowest rate (80%). The difference among schools is not significant ($X^2 = 7.81$, df = 4, NS).

Ninety-eight percent of the 1964 class of the College Discovery Program enrolled in a senior college (Table 80); all but one of the 52 graduates entered by Spring of 1968.

The second graduating class (those who entered in 1965) had fewer entrants into senior college (Table 81); 150 students graduated from the College Discovery Program, and 127 (85%) went on to senior college.

B. College Discovery Program Graduates Who Did Not Enter A Senior College

Graduates who did not enter senior college (N = 24) are not necessarily dropouts from further training. Table 82 shows that six students were in military service after graduation, one student went

TABLE 79

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATION AND SENIOR COLLEGE ENTRANCE AS OF SPRING, 1968 BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	Entering Class	Graduates		Entered Sr. College	
		N	% of Tot. Ent. CDP	N	% of Graduates
Bronx	260	59	22.7	54	91.5
Queensborough	182	28	15.4	28	100.0
Kingsborough	111	29	26.1	25	86.2
Manhattan	104	30	28.8	26	86.7
New York City	103	56	54.4	45	80.4
TOTAL	760	202	26.6	178	88.1

$X^2 = 7.81$

df = 4

Not Significant

TABLE 80

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATION AND SENIOR COLLEGE ENTRANCE AS OF SPRING, 1968 BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	Entering Class	Graduates		Entered Sr. College	
		N	% of Tot. Ent. CDP	N	% of Graduates
Bronx	120	32	26.7	31	96.9
Queensborough	111	20	18.0	20	100.0
TOTAL	231	52	22.5	51	98.1

TABLE 81

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATION AND SENIOR COLLEGE ENTRANCE AS OF SPRING, 1968 BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	Entering Class	Graduates		Entered Sr. College	
		N	% of Tot. Ent. CDP	N	% of Graduates
Bronx	140	27	19.3	23	85.2
Queensborough	71	8	11.3	8	100.0
Kingsborough	111	29	26.1	25	86.2
Manhattan	104	30	28.8	26	86.7
New York City	103	56	54.4	45	80.0
TOTAL	529	150	28.4	127	84.7

TABLE 82

PRESENT STATUS OF GRADUATES NOT ENTERING SENIOR COLLEGE BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	Community College						
Present Status	Bronx	Queens.	Kings.	Man.	N.Y.C.	Total	%
Working	2	0	1	2	6	11	52.4
Military Service	2	0	2	1	1	6	28.6
Housewife	0	0	0	0	2	2	9.5
Nursing School	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.8
Advanced Work at Community College	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.8
TOTAL	4	0	3	4	10	21	100.0
No Information	1	0	1	0	1	3	
GRAND TOTAL	5	0	4	4	11	24	
%	20.8	0.0	16.7	16.7	45.8	100.0	

on to nursing school, and another took additional training at New York City Community College. In addition, 11 students went to work, two became housewives, and information was lacking for three others.

An ethnic breakdown for graduates who did not enter senior college (Table 83) indicated that most of the Negroes (5 of 7) were employed after graduation, one was in nursing school, and one was a housewife. Four of the seven Puerto Rican graduates entered the military service and three were employed. Three of the six whites were employed, the others going on to military service, advanced community college work or marriage.

C. Senior College Enrollment: College, Session and Current Registration

Combining senior college data for the 1964 and 1965 CDP classes (Table 84), we find that 92% of the students (N = 164) had enrolled in day sessions, while the other 8% (N = 14) enrolled in evening sessions. Ninety percent of the students entered the City University system (N = 160), while the other 10% (N = 18) entered senior colleges outside the City University system.

Ninety-four percent (N = 168) of those who entered senior college were still enrolled in Spring, 1968. All of those who dropped out (N = 10) were enrolled in day sessions, all but one in the City University System. Each Community College of origin had at least one dropout, New York City leading with four and Kingsborough having three.

Table 85 shows that 41 (80%) of the 51 CDP graduates of the 1964 class entered day sessions of a senior college in the City Univer-

TABLE 83

PRESENT STATUS OF GRADUATES NOT ENTERING SENIOR COLLEGE BY ETHNIC GROUP FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	Ethnic Group						
Present Status	Negro (USA born)	Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	White (USA born)	Other Spanish-Speaking	Asian	Total	%
Working	5	3	3	0	0	11	52.3
Military Service	0	4	1	1	0	6	28.6
Housewife	1	0	1	0	0	2	9.5
Nursing School	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.8
Advanced Work at Community College	0	0	1	0	0	1	4.8
TOTAL	7	7	6	1	0	21	100.0
No Information	0	2	0	0	1	3	
GRAND TOTAL	7	9	6	1	1	24	
%	29.2	37.5	25.0	4.2	4.2	100.0	

TABLE 84

STATUS OF GRADUATES ENTERING SENIOR COLLEGE, TYPE OF COLLEGE, AND SESSION AS OF SPRING, 1968, FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

Students Entering a Senior College in City University System

	Ent. Day	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Ent. Eve.	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Total Day & Eve.	Total With-drew	Total Reg. Sp.'68
Bronx	46	1	45	6	0	6	52	1	51
Queensborough	22	1	21	3	0	3	25	1	24
Kingsborough	22	2	20	0	0	0	22	2	20
Manhattan	20	1	19	2	0	2	22	1	21
New York City	37	4	33	2	0	2	39	4	35
SUB TOTALS	147	9	138	13	0	13	160	9	151

Students Entering a Senior College Outside of City University System

	Ent. Day	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Ent. Eve.	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Total Day & Eve.	Total With-drew	Total Reg. Sp.'68
Bronx	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
Queensborough	2	0	2	1	0	1	3	0	3
Kingsborough	3	1	2	0	0	0	3	1	2
Manhattan	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	4
New York City	6	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	6
SUB TOTALS	17	1	16	1	0	1	18	1	17

Total Students Entering a Senior College

	Ent. Day	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Ent. Eve.	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Total Day & Eve.	Total With-drew	Total Reg. Sp.'68
Bronx	48	1	47	6	0	6	54	1	53
Queensborough	24	1	]3	4	0	4	28	1	27
Kingsborough	25	3	22	0	0	0	25	3	22
Manhattan	24	1	23	2	0	2	26	1	25
New York City	43	4	39	2	0	2	45	4	41
GRAND TOTALS	164	10	154	14	0	14	178	10	168

m

TABLE 85

STATUS OF GRADUATES ENTERING SENIOR COLLEGE, TYPE OF COLLEGE, AND SESSION AS OF SPRING, 1968, FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	Ent. Day	With- drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Ent. Eve.	With- drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Total Day & Eve.	Total With- drew	Total Reg. Sp.'68
Students Entering a Senior College in City University System									
Bronx	25	1	24	4	0	4	29	1	28
Queensborough	16	1	15	2	0	2	18	1	17
SUB TOTALS	41	2	39	6	0	6	47	2	45
Students Entering a Senior College Outside of City University System									
Bronx	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
Queensborough	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	2
SUB TOTALS	3	0	3	1	0	1	4	0	4
Total Students Entering a Senior College									
Bronx	27	1	26	4	0	4	31	1	30
Queensborough	17	1	16	3	0	3	20	1	19
GRAND TOTALS	44	2	42	7	0	7	51	2	49

sity system, six entered evening sessions in the City University system, and four entered senior colleges outside the City University system. Only two students subsequently dropped out of senior college; 49 students were still registered in a senior college for the Spring semester, 1968.

Table 86 shows that 113 (89%) of the 127 graduates of the 1965 CDP class who went on to senior college entered the City University system, all but seven in day sessions. Fourteen graduates (11%) entered schools outside of CUNY, all in day sessions.

The 1965 class had a slightly higher senior college dropout rate than the 1964 class. The eight dropouts constituted 6% of the senior college entrants: four were from New York City, three from Kingsborough, and one from Manhattan (none were from Bronx or Queensborough, the only schools in the 1964 class). One hundred nineteen students were still registered during the Spring semester, 1968.

D. Ethnicity and Sex of Senior College Students

When classified by ethnicity and sex (Table 87), no clear differences emerged among those CDP graduates from the 1964 and 1965 classes who entered senior college. Fifty-three percent of the students who entered CDP were male, 47% female. Slightly over one-quarter of both entering males and entering females graduated CDP, and almost 90% of the graduates of both sexes went on to senior college. The percentage of withdrawals from senior college is again almost exactly equal for both sexes (6%).

TABLE 86

STATUS OF GRADUATES ENTERING SENIOR COLLEGE, TYPE OF COLLEGE, AND SESSION AS OF SPRING, 1968, FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

Students Entering a Senior College in City University System

	Ent. Day	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Ent. Eve.	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Total Day & Eve.	Total With-drew	Total Reg. Sp.'68
Bronx	21	0	21	2	0	2	23	0	23
Queensborough	6	0	6	1	0	1	7	0	7
Kingsborough	22	2	20	0	0	0	22	2	20
Manhattan	20	1	19	2	0	2	22	1	21
New York City	37	4	33	2	0	2	39	4	35
SUB TOTALS	106	7	99	7	0	7	113	7	106

Students Entering a Senior College Outside City University System

	Ent. Day	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Ent. Eve.	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Total Day & Eve.	Total With-drew	Total Reg. Sp.'68
Bronx	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queensborough	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Kingsborough	3	1	2	0	0	0	3	1	2
Manhattan	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	4
New York City	6	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	6
SUB TOTALS	14	1	13	0	0	0	14	1	13

Total Students Entering a Senior College

	Ent. Day	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Ent. Eve.	With-drew	Reg. Sp.'68	Total Day & Eve.	Total With-drew	Total Reg. Sp.'68
Bronx	21	0	21	2	0	2	23	0	23
Queensborough	7	0	7	1	0	1	8	0	8
Kingsborough	25	3	22	0	0	0	25	3	22
Manhattan	43	4	39	2	0	2	45	4	41
GRAND TOTALS	120	8	112	7	0	7	127	8	119

TABLE 87

GRADUATION FROM CDP AND ENTRANCE AND WITHDRAWAL FROM SENIOR COLLEGE AS OF SPRING, 1968 BY SIX AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	Entered CDP			Graduated CDP						Entered Senior College						Withdrawn from Senior College					
	Male	Fem	Total	Male	% of Total CDP	Fem	% of Total CDP	Total	% of Total CDP	Male	% of Grad	Fem	% of Grad	Total	% of Grad	Male	% of Total Sr.Col.	Fem	% of Total Sr.Col.	Total	% of Total Sr.Col.
NEGRO (USA born)	145	191	336	28	19.3	40	20.9	68	20.2	25	89.3	36	90.0	61	89.7	1	4.0	1	2.8	2	3.3
PUERTO RICAN (USA or PR born)	115	55	170	36	31.3	21	38.2	57	33.5	30	83.3	18	85.7	48	84.2	2	6.7	1	5.6	3	6.2
WHITE (USA born)	82	65	147	18	22.0	18	27.7	36	24.5	16	88.9	14	77.8	30	83.3	2	12.5	1	7.1	3	10.0
OTHER SPANISH-SPEAKING	20	11	31	7	35.0	4	36.4	11	35.5	6	85.7	4	100.0	10	90.9	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0
FOREIGN-BORN WHITE	19	7	26	9	47.4	3	42.8	12	46.2	9	100.0	3	100.0	12	100.0	-	0.0	1	33.3	1	8.3
FOREIGN-BORN NEGRO	16	20	36	6	37.5	4	20.0	10	27.8	6	100.0	4	100.0	10	100.0	1	16.7	-	0.0	1	10.0
ASIAN	6	5	11	3	50.0	5	100.0	8	72.7	3	100.0	4	80.0	7	87.5	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0
Not Ascertained	3	-	3	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.0
TOTAL	406	354	760	107	26.4	95	26.8	202	26.6	95	88.8	83	87.4	178	88.1	6	6.3	4	4.9	10	5.6

Of the three major ethnic groups, Puerto Ricans graduated from CDP more frequently than United States-born whites or United States-born Negroes (34%, 25%, and 20%, respectively). Over 80% of all three ethnic groups who graduated CDP later entered senior college, Negroes (90%) entering somewhat more frequently than Puerto Ricans (84%) or whites (83%). Dropouts from senior college for all three groups were low, never more than three for any ethnic group.

Members of other ethnic groups (other Spanish-speaking, foreign-born Negroes and Whites, Asians, and those whose race could not be ascertained) constituted 14% of the 1964-1965 CDP population (107 of 760). Taken together, these students graduated from CDP in slightly greater percentages than any of the three major ethnic groups (38% of combined other ethnic groups as compared with 34% of combined major ethnic groups). Within the other ethnic groups, foreign-born Negroes graduated from CDP least often (28% for foreign-born Negroes vs. 44% for others).

The other ethnic groups went on to senior college at a slightly higher rate than the major ethnic groups (95% versus 86%, respectively), and had a slightly smaller percentage of senior college withdrawals (5% versus 6%).

E. Choice of Senior Colleges in CUNY

Table 88 presents the graduates from the 1964 class who entered senior college in the City University system and were still enrolled in January, 1968. Most were enrolled in CCNY (27 of 47).

TABLE 88

GRADUATES OF 1964 ENTERING CLASS WHO ENTERED A CUNY SENIOR COLLEGE BY SESSION AND COLLEGE AS OF SPRING, 1968 REGISTRATION

Senior College	Day Session			Evening Session			Total Day and Evening Sessions		
	Bronx	Queens-borough	Total	Bronx	Queens-borough	Total	Bronx	Queens-borough	Total
CCNY	18	8	26	1		1	19	8	27
HUNTER	5	3	8	3	1	4	8	4	12
BROOKLYN	1	2	3				1	2	3
BARUCH	1		1		1	1	1	1	2
QUEENS	—	3	3	—	—	—	—	3	3
TOTAL	25	16	41	4	2	6	29	18	47

Twelve of the graduates entered Hunter, the rest being divided between Brooklyn (3), Queens (3), and Baruch (2). Only six students entered evening sessions, four of these going to Hunter.

Graduates of CDP from Bronx enrolled predominantly in CCNY (19 of 29), and eight enrolled in Hunter. The other Bronx graduates entered Brooklyn or Baruch, and none went to Queens. Queensborough graduates also went to CCNY more often than other schools, although fewer than half did so (8 of 18). Other Queensborough graduates went to Hunter (4), Queens (3), Brooklyn (2) or Baruch (1).

The 113 graduates from the 1965 class who chose a City University college (Table 89) also entered CCNY (30) more often than any other college, although Richmond (28) and Hunter (27) were chosen almost as frequently. The remaining graduates chose Brooklyn (15), Baruch (7), or Queens (6). All but seven of the 1965 CDP students entered day sessions at the senior colleges. With regard to evening sessions, Hunter (4) was most frequently chosen, followed by Baruch (2) and Queens (1).

Graduates of Bronx Community College went to Hunter (15) or CCNY (8). Queensborough graduates chose Hunter (3), Queens (2), CCNY (1) and Baruch (1). Kingsborough graduates went most frequently to Brooklyn (10), followed by CCNY (4), Richmond (4), Hunter (2), Baruch (1) and Queens (1). Graduates of Manhattan most frequently chose CCNY (9) or Richmond (7), followed by Hunter (3), Baruch (1) and Queens (1). New York City graduates were scattered among all six senior colleges, most frequently going to Richmond (16) or CCNY (8), followed by Brooklyn (5), Baruch (5), Hunter (3), and Queens (2).

TABLE 89

GRADUATES OF 1965 ENTERING CLASS WHO ENTERED A CUNY SENIOR COLLEGE BY SESSION AND COLLEGE AS OF SPRING, 1968 REGISTRATION

	Day Session						Evening Session						Total Day and Evening Sessions					
	Community College																	
Senior College	Bronx	Queens	Kings	Man.	NYC	Total	Bronx	Queens	Kings	Man.	NYC	Total	Bronx	Queens	Kings	Man.	NYC	Total
CCNY	8	1	4	9	8	30							8	1	4	9	8	30
HUNTER	13	3	2	3	2	23	2			1	1	4	15	3	2	4	3	27
RICHMOND			4	7	16	27								1	4	7	16	28
BROOKLYN			10		5	15									10		5	15
BARUCH		1	1		4	6				1	1	2			1	1	5	7
QUEENS		1	1	1	2	5		1				1		2	1	1	2	6
T O T A L	21	6	22	20	37	106	2	1	-	2	2	7	23	7	22	22	39	113

Most 1965 CDP graduates went to senior colleges in Manhattan (56%).

When data for the 1964 and 1965 entering classes are combined (Table 90), it can be seen that over one-third of the CDP graduates chose CCNY (57), followed by Hunter (39), Richmond (27), Brooklyn (18), Baruch (10), and Queens (9). Most of the evening college students went to Hunter (8).

F. Withdrawals from Senior College

Ten CDP graduates who entered senior college had subsequently withdrawn by January, 1968 (Table 91), as follows: CCNY (3), Richmond (3), Brooklyn (2), Hunter (1) and Colby College (1). Withdrawals from CCNY represented 5% of the CDP entries there, while those from Richmond and Brooklyn represented 11% of each entering group. Four (9%) graduates from New York City and three (12%) graduates from Kingsborough had withdrawn from senior college by January, 1968. The other community colleges had one withdrawal each.

TABLE 90

GRADUATES OF 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED WHO ENTERED A CUNY SENIOR COLLEGE BY SESSION AND COLLEGE AS OF SPRING, 1968 REGISTRATION

Community College

	Day Session						Evening Session						Total Day and Evening Sessions					
Senior College	Bronx	Queens.	Kings.	Man.	NYC	Total	Bronx	Queens.	Kings.	Man.	NYC	Total	Bronx	Queens	Kings.	Man.	NYC	Total
CCNY	26	9	4	9	8	56	1					1	27	9	4	9	8	57
HUNTER	18	6	2	3	2	31	5	1		1	1	8	23	7	2	4	3	39
RICHMOND			4	7	16	27									4	7	16	27
BROOKLYN	1	2	10		5	18							1	2	10		5	18
BARUCH	1	1	1		4	7		1		1	1	3	1	2	1	1	5	10
QUEENS		4	1	1	2	8		1				1		5	1	1	2	9
TOTAL	46	22	22	20	37	147	6	3		2	2	13	52	25	22	22	39	160

TABLE 91

GRADUATES OF 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED WHO WITHDREW FROM SENIOR COLLEGE BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	Community College						
Senior College	Bronx	Queensborough	Kingsborough	Manhattan	New York City	Total	%
CCNY	1	0	0	1	1	3	30.0
HUNTER	0	1	0	0	0	1	10.0
RICHMOND	0	0	1	0	2	3	30.0
BROOKLYN	0	0	1	0	1	2	20.0
QUEENS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
COLBY	0	0	1	0	0	1	10.0
TOTAL	1	1	3	1	4	10	100.0
%	10.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	100.0	

VI. Senior College Performance of College Discovery Program Graduates

The following section deals with the experiences of CDP graduates in senior college. The number of credits earned and grade point averages will be related to community college attended, senior college attended, ethnic group and sex of student.

Although 178 CDP students had entered senior college by Spring, 1968, only 148 students had been enrolled for at least one semester (30 students registered for their first senior college semester in Spring, 1968). The group was further reduced by 10 students who took non-credit courses only, withdrew without penalty, or whose transcripts were unavailable. Therefore, the following analyses are based on 138 cases.

A. Senior College Earned and Grade Point Averages

Grade point averages for credited courses were available for 49 students who entered CDP in 1964 and went on to senior college (Table 92). The mean grade point average for these students was 2.46 between C and B)[9] and they had earned an average of 25.7 credits by January, 1968. The Bronx graduates performed somewhat better than the

---

[9] Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 92

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Bronx	30	27.7	2.57
Queensborough	19	22.6	2.29
TOTAL	49	25.7	2.46

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=5).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

graduates of Queensborough, both in mean number of credits earned (27.7 vs. 22.6) and grade point average (2.57 vs 2.29). However, neither difference was significant (t = 1.42 for credits earned; t = 1.63 for grade point average; df = 47 for both tests).[10]

The graduates of the 1965 CDP class (Table 93) maintained a mean grade point average of 1.91 and earned an average of nearly 12 senior college credits by January, 1968. Graduates of Queensborough stood out with an average of 20.5 senior college credits earned by attending summer school as well as regular senior college courses. On the other hand, New York City graduates earned the smallest number of credits, a mean of 9.8. The t-tests, correcting for differences between cell numbers and variances (Table 94), yielded significant differences between New York City (M = 9.8 credits) and both Queensborough (M = 20.5 credits) and Manhattan (M = 12.7).

Senior college grade point averages for the 1965 class (Table 93) ranged from 1.79 for New York City graduates to 2.40 for Queensborough graduates. In spite of the apparent differences, only Bronx graduates (M = 2.29) had significantly higher grade point averages than Manhattan graduates (M = 1.85), as shown by the corrected t-test ($t = 2.16$, $df = 32$, $p<.05$).[11]

---

[10] See Appendix for a note on statistical procedure.

[11] Although Queensborough had the highest mean grade point average, it also had the smallest number of cases (4 graduates), reducing the validity of the statistical test being used.

TABLE 93

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Bronx	10	12.3	2.29
Queensborough	4	20.5	2.40
Kingsborough	21	12.3	1.88
Manhattan	24	12.7	1.85
New York City	30	9.8	1.79
TOTAL	89	11.9	1.91

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=5), and whose transcripts are unavailable (N=3).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 94

T-TEST VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES IN MEAN SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	Bronx	Queensborough	Kingsborough	Manhattan	N.Y.C.
Bronx	--	2.76	0.00	0.33	1.29
Queensborough	2.76	--	2.04	2.98	3.7***
Kingsborough	0.00	2.04	--	0.24	1.27
Manhattan	0.33	2.98	0.24	--	2.11*
New York City	1.29	3.7***	1.27	2.11*	--

*p<.05

**p<.02

***p<.01

No significant differences were found in grade point averages between 1964 and 1965 for the two schools which had CDP classes both years (Bronx and Queensborough). Therefore, the grade point averages for 1964 and 1965 were combined, yielding a mean for all schools of 2.11 (Table 95).

The graduates of Bronx and Queensborough (Table 96) had significantly higher grades than all other graduates, with one exception: although Queensborough graduates had higher grade point averages than Kingsborough graduates, this difference did not reach significance.

It would not be meaningful to compare number of credits earned by graduates of each shool because Bronx and Queensborough were represented in both 1964 and 1965 classes, while all the other schools were represented only in 1965. Inspection shows, however, that graduates of New York City earned the fewest senior college credits.

B. Performance in CUNY and Non-CUNY Senior Colleges

Table 97 shows that 45 of the 49 graduates of the 1964 class entered a college in the City University system; 43 in day sessions and two in evening sessions. For those who entered a college outside the City University system, two entered day sessions and one entered evening session. Because there are so few graduates outside of City University day sessions, statistical comparisons of credits earned and grade point averages between CUNY and Non-CUNY colleges and day vs. evening sessions are inappropriate. However, inspection shows that day session students earned more credits (M = 26.9) than evening session

TABLE 95

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Bronx	40	23.8	2.50
Queensborough	23	22.3	2.31
Kingsborough	21	12.3	1.88
Manhattan	24	12.7	1.85
New York City	30	9.8	1.75
TOTAL	138	16.8	2.11

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=5), and whose transcripts are unavailable (N=3).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 96

T-TEST VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES IN MEAN SENIOR COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED.

	Bronx	Queensborough	Kingsborough	Manhattan	N.Y.C.
Bronx	--	1.31	3.86***	4.76***	4.27***
Queensborough	1.31	--	2.00	2.52**	2.30*
Kingsborough	3.86***	2.00	--	0.15	0.38
Manhattan	4.76***	2.52**	0.15	--	0.29
New York City	4.27***	2.30*	0.38	0.29	--

*p<.05

**p<.02

***p<.001

TABLE 97

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY SESSION AND COLLEGE FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

Students Who Entered a Senior College in City University System

	Entered Day			Entered Evening			Total Day and Evening		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Bronx	26	29.8	2.60	2	8.0	2.67	28	28.3	2.61
Queensborough	17	23.4	2.20	-	-	-	17	23.4	2.20
SUBTOTAL	43	27.3	2.44	2	8.0	2.67	45	26.2	2.45

Students Who Entered a Senior College Outside of City University System

	Entered Day			Entered Evening			Total Day and Evening		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Bronx	2	19.5	2.08	-	-	-	2	19.5	2.08
Queensborough	1	25.0	3.00	1	7.0	3.14	2	16.0	3.07
SUBTOTAL	3	21.3	2.39	1	7.0	3.14	4	17.8	2.58

Total Students Entering a Senior College

	Entered Day			Entered Evening			Total Day and Evening		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Bronx	28	29.1	2.57	2	8.0	2.67	30	27.7	2.57
Queensborough	18	23.5	2.24	1	7.0	3.14	19	22.6	2.29
GRAND TOTAL	46	26.9	2.44	3	7.7	2.82	49	25.7	2.46

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=7).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows: A=4.00; B=3.00; C=2.00; D=1.00; F=0.00.

students (M = 7.7), with City University students earning more day session credits (M = 27.3) than non-City University students (M = 21.3). The mean grade point average for the three evening sessions students (2.82) was slightly higher than the grade point average for day students (2.44), possibly because of their lighter credit load or more lenient grading practices in evening sessions. Finally, City University day students had slightly higher grade point averages (2.44) than non-City University students (2.39).

Graduates of Bronx accumulated more credits (M = 29.8) in day sessions of City University than did graduates of Queensborough (M = 23.4). Bronx also was higher than Queensborough in mean grade point average (2.60 and 2.20, respectively). When CDP graduates who did not enter day sessions at City University were added to those who did, Bronx still remained higher than Queensborough both in mean number of credits earned (27.7 and 22.6, respectively) and grade point average (2.57 and 2.29), although neither difference was statistically significant (t = 1.42 for credits; t = 1.62 for grade point average, df = 44).

As was true of the previous class, most graduates of the 1965 class (Table 98) entered day sessions in the City University system (76 of 89 graduates accounted for who went to senior college). Eleven entered day sessions outside the City University system and two entered evening sessions in the City University system.

TABLE 98

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY SESSION AND COLLEGE FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	Entered Day			Entered Evening			Total Day and Evening		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Students Who Entered a Senior College in City University System									
Bronx	10	12.3	2.29	-	-	-	10	12.3	2.29
Queensborough	3	19.3	2.19	-	-	-	3	19.3	2.19
Kingsborough	18	11.9	1.78	-	-	-	18	11.9	1.78
Manhattan	19	12.5	1.74	1	9.0	1.67	20	12.3	1.73
New York City	26	9.3	1.74	1	3.0	2.00	27	9.1	1.75
SUBTOTAL	76	11.5	1.84	2	6.0	1.84	78	11.4	1.84
Students Who Entered a Senior College Outside of City University System									
Bronx	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Queensborough	1	24.0	3.04	-	-	-	1	24.0	3.04
Kingsborough	3	15.0	2.54	-	-	-	3	15.0	2.54
Manhattan	4	14.8	2.46	-	-	-	4	14.8	2.46
New York City	3	16-0	2.22	-	-	-	3	16.0	2.22
SUBTOTAL	11	16.0	2.47	-	-	-	11	16.0	2.47
Total Students Entering a Senior College									
Bronx	10	12.3	2.29	-	-	-	10	12.3	2.29
Queensborough	4	20.5	2.40	-	-	-	4	20.5	2.40
Kingsborough	21	12.3	1.88	-	-	-	21	12.3	1.88
Manhattan	23	12.9	1.86	1	9.0	1.67	24	12.7	1.85
New York City	29	9.9	1.79	1	3.0	2.00	30	9.8	1.79
GRAND TOTAL	87	12.0	1.92	2	6.0	1.84	89	11.9	1.91

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=7), and whose transcripts were unavailable (N=4).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows: A=4.00; B=3.00; C=2.00; D=1.00; F=0.00.

Day session students in the City University earned fewer credits ($M = 11.5$) and had lower grade point averages ($M = 1.84$) than non-City University day session students (mean credits earned = 16.0, mean grade point average = 2.47). The difference in mean number of credits earned was significant ($t = 2.47$, $df = 85$, $p<.05$), as was the difference in mean grade point average ($t = 2.75$, $df = 85$, $p<.01$).

Table 99 combines the results of the 1964 and 1965 classes. Caution should be used in interpreting this table because Bronx and Queensborough are the only schools that contributed graduates in both years. Most of the graduates were enrolled in the City University; 119 in day sessions anf four in evening sessions. The rest were in colleges outside of the City University; 14 in day sessions and one in evening sessions.

City University students earned almost the same mean credits as non-City University students ($M = 16.9$ and 16.5, respectively), but had lower grade point averages than non-CUNY students ($M = 2.06$ and 2.40, respectively). The difference in grade point averages is significant ($t = 2.16$, $df = 136$, $p<.05$).

C. Credits Earned and Grade Point Averages in Each Senior College

Table 100 shows that most of the 1964 CDP graduates entered CCNY; the others attended Hunter (12), Brooklyn (3), Queens (3) and Baruch (1). In addition, four graduates entered colleges outside the City University system.

More graduates of the 1965 CDP class accounted for (Table 101)

TABLE 99

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY SESSION AND COLLEGE FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	Entered Day			Entered Evening			Total Day and Evening		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Students Who Entered a Senior College in City University System									
Bronx	36	25.0	2.51	2	8.0	2.67	38	24.1	2.52
Queensborough	20	22.8	2.20	-	-	-	20	22.8	2.20
Kingsborough	18	11.9	1.78	-	-	-	18	11.9	1.78
Manhattan	19	12.5	1.74	1	9.0	1.67	20	12.3	1.73
New York City	26	9.3	1.74	1	3.0	2.00	27	9.1	1.75
SUBTOTAL	119	17.2	2.06	4	7.0	2.25	123	16.9	2.06
Students Who Entered a Senior College Outside of City University System									
Bronx	2	19.5	2.08	-	-	-	2	19.5	2.08
Queensborough	2	24.5	3.02	1	7.0	3.14	3	18.7	3.06
Kingsborough	3	15.0	2.54	-	-	-	3	15.0	2.54
Manhattan	4	14.8	2.46	-	-	-	4	14.8	2.46
New York City	3	16.0	2.22	-	-	-	3	16.0	2.22
SUBTOTAL	14	17.1	2.45	1	7.0	3.14	15	16.5	2.49
Total Students Entering a Senior College									
Bronx	38	24.7	2.49	2	8.0	2.67	40	23.8	2.50
Queensborough	22	23.0	2.27	1	7.0	3.14	23	22.3	2.31
Kingsborough	21	12.3	1.88	-	-	-	21	12.3	1.88
Manhattan	23	12.9	1.86	1	9.0	1.67	24	12.7	1.85
New York City	29	9.9	1.79	1	3.0	2.00	30	9.8	1.79
GRAND TOTAL	133	17.2	2.10	5	7.0	2.43	138	16.8	2.11

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=7), and whose transcripts were unavailable (N=4).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows: A=4.00; B=3.00; C=2.00; D=1.00; F=0.00.

TABLE 100

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY CUNY AND NON-CUNY SENIOR COLLEGE AND SESSION FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	Day Session			Evening Session			Total Day and Evening		
Senior College	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
CCNY	25	25.8	2.47	1	7.0	2.00	26	25.1	2.45
Hunter	11	27.5	2.44	1	9.0	3.33	12	26.0	2.52
Brooklyn	3	27.6	1.92	-	-	-	3	27.6	1.92
Baruch	1	26.0	2.36	-	-	-	1	26.0	2.36
Queens	3	39.0	2.77	-	-	-	3	39.0	2.77
TOTAL CUNY COLLEGES	43	27.3	2.44	2	8.0	2.67	45	26.4	2.45
TOTAL NON-CUNY COLLEGES	3	21.3	2.39	1	7.0	3.14	4	17.8	2.58

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=2).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 101

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY CUNY AND NON-CUNY SENIOR COLLEGE AND SESSION FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	Day Session			Evening Session			Total Day and Evening		
Senior College	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
CCNY	19	11.7	1.89	-	-	-	19	11.7	1.89
Hunter	15	13.8	2.10	-	-	-	15	13.8	2.10
Richmond	21	9.6	1.52	-	-	-	21	9.6	1.52
Brooklyn	12	12.3	1.87	-	-	-	12	12.3	1.87
Baruch	5	11.4	1.73	2	6.0	1.84	7	9.9	1.76
Queens	4	9.8	2.25	-	-	-	4	9.8	2.25
TOTAL CUNY COLLEGES	76	11.5	1.84	2	6.0	1.84	78	11.4	1.84
TOTAL NON-CUNY COLLEGES	11	16.0	2.47				11	16.0	2.46

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=2), and whose transcripts were unavailable (N=3).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

were enrolled in CUNY senior colleges than in non-CUNY colleges (78 vs. 11). Richmond College, a new experimental school for juniors and seniors only, had the largest number of students (21), while others attended CCNY (19), Hunter (15), Brooklyn (12), Baruch (7) and Queens (4). The mean number of credits earned by students in the City University was 11.4, as compared with a mean of 16.0 outside the City University. City University students also had a lower mean grade point average (1.84) than non-City University students (2.46).

Richmond College students stand out because they had both the lightest credit load (M = 9.6) and the lowest grade point average (M = 1.52).

Table 102 combines the 1964 and 1965 classes. Because 1964 and 1965 CDP graduates are unevenly distributed between City University schools, affecting the number of credits earned at each school, and because only 1965 graduates entered Richmond, comparisons for the combined 1964 and 1965 classes should be made with extreme caution.

Students at Queens earned the greatest mean number of credits (22.3), followed by CCNY (19.5), Hunter (19.2), Brooklyn (15.4), Baruch (11.9) and Richmond (9.6). Richmond students lag behind all others but Baruch in credits earned (t-test values and significance levels are shown in Table 103).

There seems to be a correlation between number of credits earned and grade point average for each of the senior colleges. In addition to earning more credits, Queens students maintained the highest mean grade point average (2.47). CCNY (M = 2.22) and Hunter (M = 2.29)

TABLE 102

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY CUNY AND NON-CUNY SENIOR COLLEGE AND SESSION FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

Senior College	Day Session			Evening Session			Total Day and Evening		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
CCNY	44	19.7	2.22	1	7.0	2.00	45	19.5	2.22
Hunter	26	19.6	2.25	1	9.0	3.33	27	19.2	2.29
Richmond	21	9.6	1.52	-	-	-	21	9.6	1.52
Brooklyn	15	15.4	1.88	-	-	-	15	15.4	1.88
Baruch	6	13.8	1.83	2	6.0	1.84	8	11.9	1.83
Queens	7	21.0	2.47	-	-	-	7	22.3	2.47
TOTAL CUNY COLLEGES	119	17.2	2.06	4	7.0	2.25	123	16.9	2.06
TOTAL NON-CUNY COLLEGES	14	17.1	2.45	1	7.0	3.14	15	16.5	2.49

*Excludes Students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=2), and whose transcripts were unavailable (N=3).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 103

T-TEST VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES IN MEAN CREDITS BETWEEN CUNY COLLEGES FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	CCNY	Hunter	Richmond	Bklyn	Baruch	Queens
CCNY	-	0.11	3.83**	1.27	1.88	0.57
HUNTER	0.11	-	3.10**	0.10	1.53	0.54
RICHMOND	3.83**	3.10**	-	2.17*	0.83	2.95**
BROOKLYN	1.27	0.10	2.17*	-	0.92	1.25
BARUCH	1.88	1.53	0.83	0.92	-	1.63
QUEENS	0.57	0.54	2.95**	1.25	1.63	-

*$p<.05$

**$p<.01$

***$p<.001$

also maintained their high rank, while Brooklyn (M = 1.88), Baruch (M = 1.83) and Richmond (M = 1.52) had the lowest mean grade point averages. The Queens and Hunter mean grade point averages were significantly higher than those of Richmond, Baruch, and Brooklyn; CCNY was also significantly higher than Richmond (t-test values and significance levels are shown in Table 104).

D. Senior College Performance as Related to Community College Attended

Table 105 presents the senior college performance of CPD graduates arranged by community colleges and senior colleges attended. Comparisons of performance at different schools is difficult because of the small number of students in most categories.

Graduates of Bronx and Queensborough earned more credits at all the senior colleges they attended because these were the only community colleges with graduates from the 1964 class. CCNY and Hunter, the most popular choices of graduates from both Bronx and Queensborough, were schools in which CDP graduates did very well, while the most popular choice of New York City graduates (Richmond) was the school in which students performed most poorly.

E. Relationship of Ethnic Group and Sex to Performance in Senior College

Tables 106 to 108 present a breakdown of sex and ethnic group membership as related to credits earned and grade point averages. Females earned a mean of 17.7 credits, as opposed to 16.2 credits for males (Table 106). The female mean grade point average was 2.25, while the male mean

TABLE 104

T-TEST VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES IN MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE BETWEEN CUNY COLLEGES FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	CCNY	Hunter	Richmond	Bklyn	Baruch	Queens
CCNY	-	0.43	3.33***	1.58	1.44	0.85
HUNTER	0.43	-	3.64****	2.30*	2.34*	0.84
RICHMOND	3.33***	3.64****	-	1.31	0.89	2.58*
BROOKLYN	1.58	2.30*	1.31	-	0.21	2.33*
BARUCH	1.44	2.34*	0.89	0.21	-	3.01***
QUEENS	0.85	0.84	2.58*	2.33*	3.01***	-

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

****p<.001

TABLE 105

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY COMMUNITY AND SENIOR COLLEGE FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

CUNY Senior College	Bronx			Queensborough			Kingsborough			Manhattan			New York City			Total		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean GPA	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean GPA	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean GPA	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean GPA	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean GPA	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean GPA**
CCNY	21	25.1	2.56	8	20.6	2.15	4	12.0	1.93	7	11.6	1.57	5	11.0	2.01	45	19.5	2.22
HUNTER	15	22.0	2.52	5	19.8	2.10	1	18.0	2.16	4	12.4	1.88	2	11.3	1.87	27	19.2	2.29
RICHMOND	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5.3	0.83	7	14.0	1.83	11	7.9	1.50	21	9.6	1.52
BROOKLYN	1	32.0	1.87	2	25.3	1.95	8	14.6	1.89	-	-	-	4	7.8	1.84	15	15.4	1.88
BARUCH	1	26.0	2.36	1	13.0	1.63	1	6.0	2.00	1	9.0	1.67	4	10.3	1.75	8	11.9	1.83
QUEENS	-	-	-	4	32.3	2.68	1	9.0	2.47	1	9.0	1.67	1	9.0	2.44	7	22.3	2.47
TOTAL	38	24.1	2.52	20	22.8	2.20	18	11.9	1.78	20	12.3	1.73	27	9.1	1.75	123	16.9	2.06

*Excludes students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=7), and those whose transcripts were unavailable (N=3).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 106

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR 1964 AND 1965 ENTERING CLASSES COMBINED

	Male			Female			Total		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Negro (USA born)	23	14.7	1.71	23	18.2	2.35	46	16.4	2.03
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	23	18.1	2.13	13	20.3	2.08	36	18.9	2.12
White (USA born)	14	16.1	1.96	10	16.7	2.12	24	16.4	2.03
Other Spanish-Speaking	6	24.9	2.45	4	16.5	2.55	10	21.6	2.49
Foreign-born White	7	15.5	2.27	2	13.0	1.12	9	1.49	2.01
Foreign-born Negro	6	11.5	1.83	2	16.0	2.44	8	12.6	1.98
Asian	2	4.5	2.57	3	12.0	2.91	5	9.0	2.78
Not Ascertained	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	81	16.2	2.01	57	17.7	2.25	138	16.8	2.11

*Excludes students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=7), and whose transcripts were unavailable (N=3).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 107

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR 1964 ENTERING CLASS

	Male			Female			Total		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Negro (USA born)	8	21.6	2.18	9	28.1	2.78	17	25.0	2.50
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	10	24.2	2.52	6	28.3	2.34	16	25.8	2.45
White (USA born)	5	25.1	2.14	1	49.0	2.76	6	29.1	2.25
Other Spanish-Speaking	3	37.5	2.50	1	25.0	3.00	4	34.4	2.62
Foreign-born White	2	23.3	2.59	1	26.0	2.23	3	24.2	2.47
Foreign-born Negro	2	16.0	2.25	-	-	-	2	16.0	2.25
Asian	1	7.0	3.14	-	-	-	1	7.0	3.14
Not Ascertained	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	31	23.8	2.37	18	29.1	2.62	49	25.7	2.46

*Excludes students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=2).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00
B = 3.00
C = 2.00
D = 1.00
F = 0.00

TABLE 108

SENIOR COLLEGE CREDITS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE AS OF JANUARY, 1968 BY SEX AND ETHNIC GROUP FOR 1965 ENTERING CLASS

	Male			Female			Total		
	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.	N*	Mean Credits Earned	Mean G.P.A.**
Negro (USA born)	15	11.0	1.46	14	11.8	2.07	29	11.4	1.76
Puerto Rican (USA or PR born)	13	13.3	1.84	7	13.4	1.86	20	13.4	1.85
White (USA born)	9	11.2	1.85	9	13.1	2.05	18	12.1	1.95
Other Spanish-Speaking	3	12.3	2.40	3	13.7	2.40	6	13.0	2.40
Foreign-born White	5	12.4	2.15	1	0.0	0.0	6	10.3	1.79
Foreign-born Negro	4	9.3	1.63	2	16.0	2.44	6	11.5	1.90
Asian	1	2.0	2.00	3	12.0	2.91	4	9.5	2.69
Not Ascertained	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	50	11.5	1.78	39	12.4	2.09	89	11.9	1.91

*Excludes students who took non-credit courses only and/or withdrew without penalty (N=5), and whose transcripts were unavailable (N=3).

**Numerical grade values are equivalent to letter grades as follows:

A = 4.00	D = 1.00
B = 3.00	F = 0.00
C = 2.00	

grade point average was 2.01. Neither difference was statistically significant.

In the 1964 class (Table 107), females earned an average of 29.1 credits, while males earned an average of 23.8 credits. In addition, females had a higher mean grade point average than males (female mean = 2.62, male mean = 2.37). However, neither comparison reached statistical significance (t = 1.44 for credits, t = 1.41 for grade point average, df = 47).

In the 1965 class (Table 108), females again earned more credits than males (female mean = 12.4, male mean = 11.5), but the difference was not statistically significant (t = 0.72, df = 87). However, the mean grade point averages were higher for females (2.09) than for males (1.78), and this difference was statistically significant (t = 2.04, df = 87, $p<.05$).

In the 1964 class (Table 107), the greatest discrepancy between male and female grade point averages was found among Negroes, where females (M = 2.78) performed better than males (M = 2.18). In the 1965 class (Table 108), the male-female discrepancy was again greatest for Negroes, both USA-born (female mean = 2.07; male mean = 1.46) and foreign-born (female mean = 2.44; male mean = 1.63). The combined data for 1964 and 1965 (Table 106) shows that the greatest discrepancy between sexes was found for USA-born Negroes (female mean = 2.35; male mean = 1.71); this difference was significant at beyond the .01 level (t = 3.27, df = 44).

APPENDIX

For most of the analyses reported in this paper the statistical tests employed were the t-test or analysis of variance. Ordinarily the analysis of variance is a robust test; that is, many of its assumptions can be violated, yet the test will remain stable. However, there is one set of conditions which causes the analysis of variance to lose its ability to detect differences. When the number of cases per cell and the variance of cells differ simultaneously from one group to another, the analysis of variance is not an appropriate test (Hays, 1963).

When variance and number of cases were simultaneously discrepant in different cells, differences in means were analyzed by using the correction for t-tests suggested by Edwards (1950, pp. 106-107). This correction compensates for the loss of robustness of the analysis of variance. Use of this correction requires us to report separate t-tests for each pair of means rather than a single overall F for several means, as in the analysis of variance. The corrected t-test tends to be conservative, requiring large differences between means to reach statistical significance. We have chosen to use a conservative test rather than to report significance where violations of statistical assumptions make the ordinary procedures inappropriate.

END
DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE
U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED
6-24-70